THE MOSLEM WORLD

VOL. XXXII JULY, 1942 No. 3

THE MOSLEM WORLD AND THE FUTURE

I have been asked to write an editorial note for this number of THE MOSLEM WORLD and I do so, both with gladness and with hesitation; hesitation, because I am no expert in Muslim scholarship, but gladness because I think the magazine "The Moslem World" and the vast subject with which it is concerned have a claim upon all who are concerned with the Christian missionary enterprise. There are three arguments I would advance in support of this latter contention:

In the first place, the lands commonly thought of as Muslim comprise some of those in which the future is most uncertain and the play of different forces, religious, cultural, political and economic, most obscure.

There are not many countries of the world in which it is more difficult to predict the future than Syria, Palestine, Iraq and Persia. Egypt presents all kinds of problems to the thoughtful observer. Java is in all our minds and Java is overwhelmingly Mohammedan. India is predominantly Hindu, but the whole discussion in regard to India's independence throws into relief the importance as well as the stubborn quality of Indian Islam.

The problems which face these countries are, it is true, not exclusively religious. They are in part political, in part economic, in part social and cultural. Nevertheless the fact that in all of them there is a predominant (or, as in India, a considerable minority) basis of Islamic religious culture, means that an intelligent understanding of the

meaning of Islam is demanded. Those therefore who hold that this war must be succeeded by a resolute, corporate effort at the achievement of international order cannot neglect Islam.

In the second place, Islam remains a challenge to the Christian Church to which the Church has never yet made anything approaching an adequate response. Christians seem to be curiously unmoved by the fact that the religion of Islam began centuries after the coming of Christ to earth, that it specifically and consciously denies the incarnation and the atonement and that nowhere in the world outside of Java and to a small extent Persia and India has any appreciable impress been made by Christian evangelistic witness to Muslims. If Islam is as important to a total world view as I have already suggested that it is, its challenge to fundamental Christian doctrine can hardly be evaded. There is need here for the fervor of the saint and the labor of the scholar, for the practical witness of service and the hidden energy of prayer. Is there not something almost evasive and cowardly about a Church which so little bestirs itself in the face of a consistent and powerful challenge to the most central tenets of its own faith?

I would add a third point which I make with hesitation, as one whose studies in this field do not justify any dogmatism on his part. I venture the suggestion that a thorough facing of the Muslim challenge will be theologically and religiously rewarding. I have always felt this to be so ever since I reached a fuller understanding of the meaning of the Holy Spirit, through some small study of Islam. We are faced there with the same paradox as confronts us in the case of the Jews. The fact of a common theism suggests the thoughtless judgment that agreement is so large as to render Christian witness to Jews or to Muslims unnecessary. It is nevertheless true that those understand Judaism best who treat it most seriously, and in full loyalty to Christian truth seek to enter into a deep theological argument with it, believing that it is not merely out of secularism and unbelief but out of the

truth of his own religion that a Jew may best understand Christ. Islam is post-Christian, and its conception and fulfilment can never therefore have the same place in our thinking of Islam as it has in our thinking of Judaism. It may still be true that a thorough Christian dogmatic, while yet sympathetic in dealing with Islam, may be the key to unlock the door, as it will certainly enrich our own understanding of Christianity.

In short, we need both more people who will burn themselves out in prayer and service for Islam, and also more Christians who will give themselves to the task of theological labor. It is because I believe THE MOSLEM WORLD is of great help to the whole Church in holding its attention to these tasks that I am so glad to write these few words for it.

London WILLIAM PATON.

Dorothy Sayers on Dogma

"That there is a great split today in Christendom, nobody would deny; but the line of cleavage does not run between Catholic and Protestant or between Conformist and Nonconformist. It runs, as it ran sixteen centuries ago, between Arius and Athanasius—between those who believe that salvation is of God and those who believe that salvation is of man. Those who uphold 'Christian principles', but assert at the same time that Christ was not God, are asserting (however much they may deny it) that in the last resort their faith and ethics rely only on a human sanction. . . . . Vague talk about 'divine inspiration', 'religious genius', or 'unique like-mindedness with God' only bridges the gulf with a frail crust of words that will not stand up to the slightest pressure. If anybody thinks that Christian dogma leaves people cold, let him assert in unequivocal language that Jesus is very God, and the flood of angry correspondence swamping his letter-box will promptly undeceive him. But this is not a quarrel between the churches: it is a quarrel between Christianity and Humanism."

—*The International Review of Missions,* Jan. '42.

WHAT MOSLEMS HAVE TAUGHT ME

My first experience of work among Moslems was in the Panjab as Y.M.C.A. Student Secretary. In those days quite a number of Moslem students professed their faith, and there followed the usual struggle with the family of the convert. Opposition took the various forms of withdrawal of financial support, attempted poisoning, kidnapping and public disputations with the assembled relatives. I have never lost the impression I then got of the strength of the family tie, of the solidarity of the family with the group, and of the disgrace of apostasy. Somehow I felt that Islam in its way had greater communal strength than the Christian society I had known. There were often tragic consequences in the divorce of the individual from such an integrated way of life, and we had no comparable Christian society into which to introduce the new convert. The result was that far too great a proportion went back. One could not help feeling that while the appeal of the Gospel to the individual and his response were fundamental to any Christian life, this was no final solution of the problem of Islam.

My next experience was in central India. One day a Moslem family appeared on the station and the mother of the family told me her story. Twenty years earlier in a distant town she had come under the influence of a Zenana teacher and became absolutely convinced of the truth of the Gospel. She said she then and there believed without a doubt, but never for a moment did she feel it right to leave her husband and two children. She felt her duty to be to so live and witness that her whole family would come to believe as she did. She persevered in this for twenty years and they all now wished to be baptized

together. In baptizing this whole family I felt a satisfaction I had never felt before, seeing here a better approach to this problem than I had yet discovered. Another lesson was also learned, for though this family had been living alongside other Moslems for some time there was no opposition of any kind, from which I found that opposition usually comes from the other members of the same family and through them extends to others who come to their support.

I must admit that this latter incident made a profound impression on me and has ever since coloured my ideas of methods of approach. I have always found it difficult to analyse the motives which have led my Moslem friends to face the loss involved in proclaiming their new faith. Nor did I get to the heart of the matter until a good friend of mine, a Moslem convert and Christian College Professor, told me how it happened to him and how he thought consciously or unconsciously it happens to most Moslem converts. He told of attending the Christian College classes for eight years and hearing the regular Bible talks. At first he did not trouble about it, but later he began to wonder which religion was right as he had begun also to hear of what the Hindus and the Sikhs believed. He said he felt a shock to discover that he had to examine the tenets of four religions. He read the Bhagavad Gita, the Granth Sahib, the Koran and the Bible. He said he read the Bible three times! The result was what I asked, and he answered: "Apparently nothing. I became convinced that it did not matter much what religion one believed and that it was apparently the universal practice that people stayed by the religion they had been born into." That, he thought, tended to the stability of cultures and societies and should be encouraged. "But one day," he said, "I was sitting day-dreaming in the class room listening to the Bible teacher, and I do not know how it happened but I suddenly saw what the Christian God was really like. It flashed on me like a vision, but almost simultaneously I saw myself as I really appeared in the presence of such a

Holy God and knew myself for the sinner I was for the first time." "Then," he said, "I asked myself which of the faiths has the answer which will reconcile such a sinner to such a God. It was as clear as daylight where the answer was to be found—in the words and deeds of Jesus Christ." He concluded by remarking that no Moslem will ever be truly won to Christ except by a conviction of personal sin before a Holy God. "I place," he said, "little stress on the intellectual side, though it has its place, for only the Spirit of God can break through the bonds which hold the heart of the Moslem in thrall."

There are many comments one might make on this story and probably all workers would find something here to encourage them. But so far as I was concerned it changed my whole view of the object to be aimed at and the centrality of witness to God as revealed in Christ in whom the conscious sinner alone can find forgiveness and peace. I never felt so keen again on argument, for what I was waiting for in every case was a real miracle through the converting power of the Spirit speaking to the confessed spiritual bankruptcy of the enquirer. Wherever I have failed to keep this first I have helped to make the wrong kind of convert, or to encourage the wrong kind of motive. Most of my fellow workers through many years have been Moslem converts. They always stood out beyond others as fearless leaders of men. In my experience a sincere Moslem makes a sincere Christian, and there is much in his past training and outlook which when transformed gives strength to his Christian life and power to his witness. The call to the Christian Church to persevere with its witness to Islam in season and out of season was never more urgent than it is today.

Mildmay Park, London ALEXANDER MCLEISH.

CHINA AND ARABIA PRIOR TO THE T'ANG DYNASTY (618 A.D.)

It is strange that the first knowledge the western world had of China should come in the form of a precious cloth, which is still much sought after, even in this modern day. The land from which it came was called Σήρες, after its chief product, σηρ (silk). Interest in China from the very beginning and down to this day is mainly commercial. Until the Portuguese contested the right of the Arab in the Indian Ocean and won the ascendancy, few white men had penetrated the terrors of the East and come within its borders.

Travelling to Europe and America on a luxury liner in this modern day is almost an insult to the memory of the countless travellers and merchants of the many centuries, who brought the silks and spices to the rulers of ancient and mediaeval Europe and Asia Minor. We have depreciated their value and they, with their makers, have lost their exalted place in man's mind.

Trade between China and the West before the Christian era passed the hard way over the backbone of Asia. Up the silk road of Kansu, through the Jade Gate, out into the Gobi Desert, skirting the Tarim Basin, on to Bactria and thus through Parthia to the western market, it went to reach the courts of Europe. Neither did the Chinese see the final purchaser nor the buyer the original seller. For centuries the intermediaries were the Parthians, who picked up the cargo in the Tarim Basin and put it down on the shores of the Persian Gulf. From there it was carried by ship to Aelana in the Gulf of Akabah and thence overland to Petra and the Western world. Other routes were used, but this was the principal trade route for silk.

Strange enough, it was the armies of the people who made most use of the products that virtually cut off the ancient route in the second century of our era. The conclusion of the Parthian War, conducted under Aurelius Antoninus by Avidius Cassius, 165 A.D., saw a change in the world of commerce. Following upon this shutting of the land door, a commercial mission went forward from Ta Ts'in (the Near East) by sea to the Far East. This arrived at the Court of China, at Loyang, in October 166. Up to this time the Parthians had monopolized the trade between China and Ta Ts'in, we are told by the Ho Han Shu (E 32). The coming of this trade mission opened up a new relation between the East and the West. [1] Here was a second way by which the products of one country could travel to the other without the interference of the wild Hsiung Nu hordes of the north. There were the dangers of the sea, but larger quantities could be moved more quickly than by the slow caravan routes and there was no confining to one narrow way. An examination of the maps of the centuries will show the ports of call changing from century to century, and where one barrier was put down others could be raised.

For the land side, it was the Emperor Han Wu Ti who first extended the boundaries of China to the edge of Bactria. With the return of Ching Ch'ien from the Yueh Chih (Indo-Scythians) in 126 B.C. with stories of the Chinese goods in the markets of Bactria, China pushed its influence to the western end of the Tarim Basin. The control of that Western region rose and fell with the strength of the rulers of China, but trade managed to flow back and forth. All through the period the Parthians controlled it, the Turki people carried it. It is no different today. The Persian merchants can be met on the streets of Sian and Lanchow and colonies are in Khotan, Kashgar and Urumchi. The Turki still drives his three-horse cart, laden high with goods, into the West gate of Lanchow and the camel caravans softly steal their way through the

[1] Hirth, pp. 173-75.

night, laden as of old with goods for the markets of the West. Though the sea-borne traffic is far in excess of the land traffic, and much that formerly found its way on the backs of the Bactrians now goes in the bellies of the lumbering freighters, the ancient route still functions and shows a picture out of the past, unmistakable and awe-inspiring to one who has seen it.

Here was a mighty stream ready to carry the burden of a new faith, as it had done for others, Buddhism, Christianity, Manacheism and Zoroastrianism. Here at the beginning of the seventh century was a different faith. Islam was the faith of men who carried the burden of commerce. It was from Mohammed, a man who had been one of them. He understood their needs and they understood his speech. So it spread quickly and firmly along the trade routes of high Asia. Its demands were not too exacting, its advantage of being on the winning side very enticing.

The sea route never lost its hold on the traffic between the East and the West after the way was once known. A map of Asia in the first century A.D. shows the evidence of traffic lanes much as they are today. Men had learned to read the monsoons and to make use of them. What we now so highly praise as the Burma Road was a source of great commercial activity in that period. Cattigara (Hanoi) was an influential center of trade, from which port, and that of Canton, goods travelled all over the Chinese Empire. Fa Hsien returned home from India via the port of Tsingtao in 414 A.D. Siraf and Hormuz were Persian ports from which the goods which came from China by sea were met by the traders of the West. Aden also was important. The political situation often determined the terminus. For long periods goods that might come from South Arabia or the Red Sea were trans-shipped at the Persian Gulf ports.

It would seem that from the very beginning of the commercial intercourse between the East and the West, the sea route was entirely in the hands of the Arabs of

South Arabia, for as the editor of "Chau Ju-kua" in his introduction says, "It seems evident that, during ancient and mediaeval times, the sea-trade between Egypt and Persia on the one side, and India and the Far East on the other, remained almost exclusively in the hands of the enterprising Arabs of the southern Arabian coast, who, in very early days, established stations at all the principal ports-of-call along the coast to the south of the Indus and thence ultimately to Canton, where they appear to have had a settlement or colony as early as A.D. 300. So far as we can gather, the Greeks took little or no share in this trade beyond the Malabar Coast, and there is absolutely no evidence to substantiate the assertion that the Chinese did either. "Greeks may have got to China, and Chinese may have travelled in the sixth century as far as Aden or the head of the Persian Gulf, to Hormuz, Siraf, Basra or Baghdad, but these were isolated cases of commercial adventure, and do not affect the conclusion reached." [2]

This helps us to understand how the coast of Asia in the eighth century was dotted with Arab settlements. Outside of the Moslem area we come to Daybul (Karachi), Tana (Bombay), Kumari the tip of South India, Kalah (Kedah), Palembang in Sumatra, Annan (Hanoi), Canton, Chuan-chow, ending at Hanchou in Silla (Korea). By the beginning of the seventh century the foreign colony of Canton was mostly composed of Arabs and Persians. They were so numerous that in 758, for some reason unknown to us they were able to sack and burn the city and make off to sea with their loot. [3]

Thus it is not improbable that the faith of Mohammed, which so quickly spread over the length and breadth of Arabia, might flow through the long arms of Arab influence out across the world. Islam soon spread to the great trade centers of Arabia. Both Mecca and Medina were powerful Arab trading posts. Aden and Siraf as well as Hormuz were the focal points for the new faith to turn down the streams of Arab expansion. It is thus reasonable to

[2] Chau Ju-kua, p. 4.
[3] *idem*, p. 15.

believe that in the lifetime of the Arabian Prophet, Islam reached China.

International Trade during the T'ang, Sung and Yuan Dynasties and the Moslem Part in it.

In thinking of the Arabs and the rise of Islam, one unconsciously limits them to the camel and the desert region it traverses. But we must expand our thinking to realize that during the tenth century, when Europe had no influence in the Mediterranean, it was an Arabian Sea.[4] The great ports of Aden on the Red Sea and Oman and Siraf on the Persian Gulf kept the Mohammedan Empire supplied with the wares of India, Sumatra, China and Japan. Aden was called the "vestibule of China," but Siraf was especially the port for China, and we find a number of references to it in Chinese. This position of Siraf had for an effect that the chief language of the Mohammedan traders with India and Eastern Asia was Persian; at any rate, even the Arabic works of the tenth century offer a number of Persian nautical terms.

During the latter part of the seventh century the sea route between Arabia and China became almost exclusively the only means of communication, Canton being the port in China.[5] The Arab traders became so important that toward the end of the eighth century they formed a strong and influential part of the population of Canton. At the beginning of the ninth century we find again at the head of the Moslem colony in Canton a Mohammedan appointed by the Emperor, "Who administered justice, preached and offered prayers for the Emperor of China at the service in the Mosque!"[6]

At the fall of the T'ang dynasty the South China ports were disturbed and trade with the West was no longer direct between China and the Islamic world, but Kedah in Western Malaya, which was the predecessor of the modern Singapore, was the trading market for ships from

[4] Mez, "Renaissance of Islam," p. 508.
[5] Chau Ju-kua, p. 9.
[6] Reinaud, "Relations," p. 14.

Arabia and China. After the foundation of the Sung dynasty, at the end of the tenth century, the Chinese Government made a great effort to attract oversea commerce directly to their country. In 971 the marine bureau in Canton was reorganized, and in 980, foreign trade became a state monopoly.[7] About this time a number of Mohammedan traders visited the Chinese court and were most cordially received. In 976 an Arab brought the first black slave to the Chinese court.[8] Also at this time, the port of Tsuan chow equalled if it did not overshadow Canton, for it was not only in touch with the hinterland of China, but was a mart for Korean and Japanese goods.

Islam Enters China.

"Sahib Sa'd Wakkas came to China in the years of K'ai Huang of the Sui Dynasty" (*i.e.,* between A.D. 581-600); says the "Great Ming Geography"[9] which was commenced in A.D. 1370 and published in A.D. 1461. During most of this period Mohammed was a shepherd lad tending sheep outside of Mecca. In his twenty-fifth year (596) he entered the service of Khadijah, who later became his wife. It was about ten years after the end of the period in question that Mohammed composed his first *suras* of the Koran. Thus in these few statements we see the kernel of the problem facing anyone who attempts to make sense out of the records of the early penetration of Islam into China. The first Moslem missionary to China, according to the Chinese Moslem books, arrived before Mohammed had any idea of his spiritual mission. The problem is, how to reconcile the dates of this mythical arrival with the dates of Mohammed's life, and with those we can secure from the authentic Chinese histories of the time.

Before giving a brief account of the early traditions it is necessary to point out again, as has been done in the first part of this paper, that the Arab communications with

[7] Chau Ju-kua, p. 20; "The History of Commercial intercourse between China and Western Nations during the T'ang, Sung, and Yuan Dynasties," by Kuwabara; tr. into Chinese from Japanese by Fung Yu. p. 109 says "P'u Hsi Mi (Abu Hamid?) was in charge of the tribute from Ta Sz. in 976."

[8] Mez, p. 516.

[9] Quoted in Mason's "The Mohammedans of China," NCBRAS, Vol. lx, 1929, p. 46.

China, prior to the time of Mohammed, were continuous, and there is no reason to believe that they were broken at the time of the early manhood of Mohammed. Also we know that during the T'ang dynasty, which had its beginning with the rise of the power of Islam, China had communication with much of the rest of the world and encouraged trade. Therefore it is not at all impossible to consider that Arabs of influence were in China at the time attributed to Sahib Sa'd Wakkas (between 580-600), to whom post-humous tradition may have attributed missionary fervor. It is possible to consider that the Arabs of the China coast knew of the strange teaching of Mohammedans before the Hegira.

The most famous Chinese-Moslem writer was Liu Chieh-lien, whose standard "Life of Mohammed" was completed in 1724. He wrote thus:

"In the sixth year of K'ai Huang of the Sui dynasty (A.D. 586) which was the first year of the Prophetship of Mohammed, there was seen in the sky a strange star; the Chinese Emperor Wen Ti commanded the chief Astronomer to divine its meaning, and he said that there would be an extraordinary person appearing in the West. The Emperor sent an envoy to investigate if this was really so, and after about a year he arrived at Mecca. He desired the Prophet to accompany him back to the East, but he declined. The envoy secretly had a portrait of the Prophet made to take back with him. The prophet sent Sa'd Wakkas (his maternal uncle), and three others, to go with the envoy to China. (Moslems first entered China in the seventh year of K'ai Huang of the Sui dynasty.)

"The Emperor Wen Ti hung up the portrait of the Prophet and worshipped it, and when he arose, the scroll was there but the picture had vanished. The Emperor in alarm said, 'It must surely be that he is the Pure Emperor and the True Prince.' Wherefore he had built the 'Prophet-Remembrance Mosque' at Fan Chow (which is now Canton) for the accommodation of the embassy.

Wakkas subsequently returned to the West." [10]

A similar story is found in a popular book called "Hsi Lai Tsung P'u" [11] but it gives the Emperor as T'ang T'ai Tsung and the date of the arrival as the second year of Chen Kuan (626). The characters appear a bit different but the story is substantially the same tradition. In this latter there were three messengers sent by Mohammed overland to China, but only one, Wan Ko-szu, or Wakkas, arrived. A further date quoted by Archimandrite Palladius gives the entrance of Islam into China in 632. This is quoted in the latest history of Chinese Islam, "Chung Kuö Hui Chiao Shih Yen Chiu." [12]

M. de Thiersant in his "Le Mahometisme en Chine," [13] says, "It is not Sa'd abu Wakkas who is buried at Canton. Nor is it his son, for he did not bear his name. Moreover, it is necessary, in this case, to admit that the Chinese authors are mistaken. We prefer to suppose that the real sage, as his Chinese coreligionists designate him, Wahb-Abu-Kabcha, a maternal uncle of Mohammed, was made envoy to bear presents to the Emperor of China, and to announce to him the new doctrine. We believe, and we are sustained in the opinion by learned Mohammedans, that Wahb-Abu-Kabcha came by sea to China in the year A.D. 628 or 629 and landed at Canton."

These instances I have quoted, and there are many more which will give some idea of the confusion prevailing in the records of the historical notices of the coming of Islam to China. We might dismiss it all with a wave of the hand, as has been done by Martin Hartmann in his article on China in the "Encyclopaedia of Islam," when he says, "What the tradition of the Moslems of China itself tells us about the earliest intercourse is worthless and erroneous, although it is stated in numerous monuments in stone."

Before giving the cogent objections to some of the

[10] "Mohammedans of China," by I. Mason, in NCBRAS, Vol. lx, 1929, p. 44.
[11] Translated in I. Mason's "The Mohammedans of China," in NCBRAS, Vol. lx, 1929, pp. 46-50.
[12] By Chin Chi-T'ang, p. 48. Other places in this "Life of Mohammed" speak of Sa'd Wakkas as being Mohammed's disciple, which is more nearly the historical fact.
[13] Vol. I., pp. 43-5, quoted in I. Mason's "The Mohammedans of China," in NCBRAS, Vol. lx, 1929, p. 55.

theories enumerated above and as put forth by Marshall Broomhall and Isaac Mason, I should mention one monument which is in Sian. Mr. Mason has given an excellent translation, [14] and it can also be found in Broomhall's book. [15] The tablet, "To Record the First Building of a Mosque," is dated the first year of T'ien Pao (742). After extolling the virtues of Islam it says, "China had not heard of it (Islam), until the time of the Emperor K'ai Huang of the Sui dynasty (A.D. 581-600), when it entered China and gradually spread throughout the empire."

Let us now turn to these traditions and see if we can make anything out of them. First, who was Sa'd Wakkas, whom Liu Chieh-lien called in one place the maternal uncle of Mohammed and in another his minister? There was a Sa'd ibn abi Waqqās called Sa'd ibn Mālik ibn-Wuhayb ibn-'Abd-Manāf ibn Zuhrah ibn Kilāb ibn-Murrah, who was the seventh to embrace Islam and was present with Mohammed at all his battles. He died at al-'Atiq in 674 and was buried in Madinah. He was considered a great warrior, known as "the first who drew blood in Islam," and a noted archer in the Prophet's wars. He took rank also as the nephew of Mohammed's mother. [16] The last we hear of him in an important position is as reinstated governor of Kufa, which city he founded, but finally recalled in the year 645 by the Caliph Othman. What happened to him between the dates of 648-653 we are not able to state from the available material. [17] It is during this period that an envoy from Caliph Othman arrived in China. It seems evident that he no longer featured in the political history of the Near East.

Who was this Wahb-Abu-Kabcha to whom De Thiersant refers as being an uncle of Mohammed? Broomhall ably refutes this statement by showing that there is no proof that Wahb-Abu-Kabcha was the maternal uncle or a Sahib.

[14] "The Mohammedans of China," NCBRAS, Vol. lx, 1929, pp. 61-3.
[15] "Islam in China," p. 84.
[16] Muir's "Life of Mohammed," pp. 57, 61.
[17] Dr. Nabih Amin Faris, Princeton University.

Adjustments of Dates.

Mr. Mason, in a short but exceedingly interesting article, "Chinese-Moslem Chronology" [18] gives us a point of departure to help us fix the dates of the early entrance of Islam into China and to make some order out of the above chaos. He refers to the "difference in the Moslem year and the Chinese luni-solar year which is almost exactly eleven days a year, or about three years in a century." He quotes M. Deveria who has suggested that "perhaps in A.D. 1351, when the mosque at Canton was restored, the Chinese-Moslems transmuted their Arabic chronology into Chinese, and being ignorant of the variations between the lunar and solar years of the two systems, simply counted back the Arab years since the Hegira as so many Chinese years, thus antedating by twenty-three to twenty-four years the date they had in mind." But Mr. Mason was not satisfied with this date, 1351, so he looked for a more probable date. This he found in the historical record of the second year of Ming Hung Wu, 1369. In that year a certain Moslem Chief Astronomer, with a number of Mohammedan officials, was employed in rectifying the Chinese calendar, and at the same time they apparently essayed to correlate the Moslem calendar with the Chinese. The Chinese new year of 1369 was 770 A.D. Thus by counting back the number of Arab years without considering the variations, the date 599 was reached as the year of the Hegira, which is twenty-three years before the event took place, in 622.

With this in mind we can look at the date of the traditional first entry of Islam into China, 628, as given by most Moslem authorities. Much of the argument against acceptance of this date is that there is no evidence in official records of this event. But if we take the correction between the lunar and solar calendar we find the difference between 628 and 1369 is 741. On the basis of three years to a century, this makes twenty-two or twenty-three years' difference. That means that the correct reading should

[18] "Islam in China," pp. 78, 79.

be 650 or 651 instead of 628. This draws us nearer to the solution of the problem. In the New T'ang History, chapter 221, "the Mohammedan Arab is first met with in connection with the Persian king, Yezdergerd, whose son Firuz had previously fled to Tokharstan, from whence he sent a messenger to the Chinese Court to tell of his troubles and appeal for aid . . . . the T'ang Emperor, Kao Tsung, made excuses that the distance was too great for him to send troops to Persia, but he sent to the Moslems to plead the cause of the fallen power." [19] The following year (651) in response to this plea, it is recorded, "In the second year of Yung Hui the To Shih king, Amir-al-Mumenin first sent an envoy with tribute to the Court." [20] Thus instead of discarding the early traditions as groundless, can we not believe that tradition and Chinese historical records are referring to one and the same event? It is hoped that some day the Arabic records during the T'ang period may be examined by a critical scholar and more light may be shed upon this problem.

There is another date of interest between the one just mentioned and that on the tablet in Sian. While visiting the Great Western Mosque in Sian, which I feel to be the oldest one in that city, not the one referred to in the date of 742, to be discussed later, I found a record board over the door, giving five dates. [21] The first is 705, during the reign of T'ang Chung Tsung. All it says is, "Imperial permit to build the Pure Religion Mosque." Correcting the date, as given above, we find that 705 should really be 726. According to the same T'ang History there is this record: "In the fourteenth year of K'ai Yuan (726) another envoy was sent, Soleiman, with presents of local products, who did obeisance, and was given a red robe and girdle."

And lastly we come in this group of dates to the year 742, which was the reputed date of the building of the first mosque, now known as the Great Eastern Mosque,

[19] Quoted by Isaac Mason, "China and Moslems," *Friends of Moslems*, Vol. x, p. 75.
[20] *Ibid*, from the "T'ang History."
[21] *Friends of Moslems*, Vol. lx, July, 1935, p. 44.

Sian. All authorities have testified to its unreliability because there is nothing in Chinese history to which to tie it. But if we use the same method of correction here as was used above, we find that 742 should be 761.

In the year 745 the Emperor Hsuen Tsung became captivated by a young lady named Yang and raised her to the rank of Kuei-fei. The year before, a young upstart, An Lu-san, became a great favorite of the Emperor. The former took the mind of the Emperor so completely off matters of state that in ten years the latter was able to lead a successful rebellion. The imperial household had to flee to the west, and disappeared in Szechwan. The son took the name of Su Tsung and established the throne in Ling Wu on the right bank of the Yellow River just above Ningsia. "From the region west of China a miscellaneous army was gathered, including Uigurs, T'u Fan, Nan Man, and Ta-shih, who helped to regain the capital and put down the rebellion, which was not fully accomplished until 763." [22] This we feel gives a real explanation of the building of the mosque. What should be more fitting for the soldiers who helped to restore order than that they should have a place to worship God in their own way? We know that these and subsequent troops, who came to restore order, stayed after their duty was done and settled down in China. In Shensi and Honan the Moslems all speak of their Faith entering in the T'ang Dynasty,

Sung Dynasty.

The Sung period saw other envoys from Arabia coming to China. During this time the great port of Chuan Chow, in Fukien, flourished, and in 1010 we find the first mosque built there. In 1310 a monument was placed at the mosque reported to have been a replica of one placed there at the former date. [23] 1310 is a Sung Dynasty Chinese historical date. Taking the difference between the two dates, (300 years) makes the difference of nine years which would change 1010 to 1019. In this latter year it

[22] Mason's "The Mohammedans of China," NCBRAS, Vol. lx, 1929, p. 66.
[23] In Kuwabara's, "History of Com." p. 109.

is recorded that "P'u Ma Wu T'o P'o Li (Abu Mohammed Dawal?) was in charge of the tribute from Arabia. [24] As Ch'uan Chow was the port for the Arab trade during this period it is not a far-fetched assumption to assume that it was here he landed and his arrival gave the occasion for the erection of this mosque.

Mongol Dynasty.

The Yuan or Mongol Dynasty is chiefly of interest to us in this paper because of the influence of Seyyid Edjill Chams ed-din Omar known to the Chinese as Sai Tien-ch'ih. His ancestors had settled on the southern border of Mongolia, above Ningsia, before the time of Genghis Khan. During the reign of Mangu Khan he helped Kublai Khan conquer the country called Nan Chao, and incorporated it for the first time into the province of Yunnan. Before this he had distinguished himself as the governor-general of Kansu-Shensi-Szechuan. It was due to his influence that Mohammedanism was introduced into Yunnan. His descendants have been many and have held high positions under the Mongols. Ma Chi, a famous writer of Yunnan of the last century, claims him as an ancestor.

Na Su La Tin, son of Sai Tien-ch'ih, is best known to the West in the writings of Marco Polo who visited him on his trip to Yunnan. His name appears there as Nasr-ud-Din. He followed in his father's footsteps as governor of Yunnan. He distinguished himself in the war against Cochin-China and Burma.

In summing up these three dynasties, which lasted from 618-1368 we see Islam established as one of the religions of China. Commercially active in the T'ang and Sung Dynasties, Islam became a political force in the Yuan. In this section we have tried to show that the dates given by the Moslems in China in their books and on their tablets have foundation in fact. When these are examined in the light of the corrections there is reason to accept the facts stated. At least we can now see that Moslem dates

[24] M. Hartmann in art. "China" in Enc. of Islam.

link up with Chinese historical material. In view of this it is hoped that a more thorough examination of Chinese-Moslem steles can be carried forward.

Isolation of Ming Period and Spread of China's Influence in the Indian Ocean.

The free intercourse between the land of China and Europe was stopped between the fall of the Yuan Dynasty in 1368 and the first arrival of the Portuguese in 1511 under Raphael Perestrello. When Columbus set sail for Cathay in 1492 he carried letters to the Great Khan. 130 years after the last Khan, Europe was still unaware of the overflow of the Mongols. The Ming dynasty started as a vital protest against the extravagance of the foreign Mongols. When their rule was crushed many of the foreign enterprises they so well handled were also discontinued. Hung Wu, the first Ming emperor was conservative and used much of his time to consolidate his empire. The third emperor, Yung Lo, who built modern Peiping, again opened up the way for free trade all the way to the Persian Gulf and Africa.

This extension of China's influence so far to the West was ably carried out by their chief eunuch, Tsen Ho, who, according to historians, is the most widely traveled Chinese of history. Seven times he took expeditions to the Indian Ocean to search for the nephew of Hung Wu whose throne had been overthrown by Yung Lo. It is this eunuch, a Mohammedan, who is credited with the introduction of opium into China. The port from which Tsen Ho sailed was Ch'uan Chow, Fukien. [25]

This city appears often in the annals of the Mohammedan relations between Arabia and China. Some of the most famous Moslem travelers and writers, as Ibn Battuta, visited this port and spoke of its wonders. We know that there was a Christian Church here as well. [26] It was the port from which Marco Polo set sail for Hormuz and

[25] Called Zaitun by Marco Polo and other travelers.
[26] Refer to "Early Moslem Leaders in China," MOSLEM WORLD, Vol. xxvi, July, 1936, p. 232-9.

Europe. At its zenith it out-ranked Canton as a port for trade with the west because of its close connection with Japan and with Japanese trade. But shortly after the coming of the Portuguese, when the Mongols under Anta were harassing the Chinese on the Northern borders, the Japanese harried the coast of China, destroying this port entirely. Today Amoy takes its place as a South Fukien trading center.

The establishment of the Ming Dynasty in ascendancy over the Mongols was in no small measure due to the Moslems who gathered around Ming Hung Wu.[27] It is strange that when Christianity and Judaism were crushed by the native dynasty because of its link with the hated foreign Mongols, Islam, which also played its part, was not crushed. The answer to this problem possibly can be found in the fact that Moslem leaders played so large a part in overthrowing the Mongols.

Chu Yuan-chang, who later became the first Ming Emperor, Hung Wu, was originally a bandit chieftain of Anhwei Province. When he raised his standard of revolt, two Moslems gathered round him with their bandit hordes, and brought victory to the new cause. The first of these was Sang Yu-ch'uin. His extraordinary acts of valor have won him a place in the ranks of great warriors. On several occasions during the struggle to gain the empire, he turned defeat into victory, more than once he saved his master's life. He was made a State Councillor and also became the Duke of Wo (Hupeh). Brave to a fault, he treated his men with kindness. He was a good strategist though no scholar. He lived long enough to see the new Dynasty in existence for one year.

The second man who helped to establish the new dynasty was Mu Yin, a native of Tin Yuan, Anhwei. In 1384 he was appointed governor of Yunnan. In 1388 he gained a great victory over the Burmese.

A third man of repute who also held office as Minister of War under Hung Wu, was T'ie Hsuen. In contrast

[27] Quoted in Moule's, "Christianity in China before 1550," p. 195.

with the two men mentioned above he left a reputation as a scholar. At the death of Hung Wu this warrior remained loyal to the second emperor even after he had been overthrown by Yung Lo. T'ie Hsuen was captured and brought before the new emperor, whom he refused to face. In consequence his nose was cut off and he was made to eat it. When asked by the emperor how it tasted, he replied, "the flesh of a loyal minister and a filial son, should it not be sweet-tasting?" He was then sentenced to be boiled in oil. Even in the cauldron of oil he refused to face the Emperor, although servants attempted to force him to do so with long poles. All this so impressed the emperor that he permitted a proper burial.

This is sufficient to show the very excellent reason why Islam was favored when everything foreign was destroyed. In Wuchang [28] there is a tablet which is a copy of one first placed in Nanking. It is found in other places as well. It was written in the eighth year of Hung Wu (1375). It extols the virtues of Islam and gives a guarantee of imperial protection. From now on there was to be no question of Islam as a potent force in China. There was to be trouble ahead and rebellion but the faith of Mohammed was here to stay and to be counted as one of the religions of China.

This paper has not attempted to give a coherent picture of the early days of Islam in this land. The plan has been to give some of the problems and attempt to answer them and to show that there is a possible grain of truth in what seem to be many contradictions.

It is hoped we have shown that it was possible for Mohammedans to be in China very early, by the fact that trade with China from Arabia goes back to the third century; that it was possible for Sa'd Ibn Abi Waqqas to have come to China, though whether he did or not needs more proof than we now have; that many of the dates brushed aside by former writers on the subject can with proper consideration be considered as actual events, and

[28] Translated in *Friends of Moslems*, Vol. xi, p. 39.

that Islam was firmly established as a political as well as a religious force during the Ming Dynasty. It is hoped that a more complete study of the dates given by the Moslems may be undertaken and a thorough examination of the traditions and writings on the monuments may be made.

Hankow, China CLAUDE L. PICKENS.

SOURCES

Cathay and the Way Thither, by Col. Sir Henry Yule.

Chau Ju-Kua: His work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the 12th and 13th centuries, entitled Chu-fan-chī. Tr., F. Hirth & W. W. Rockhill.

China and the Roman Orient, by F. Hirth.

Chung Kuo Hui Chiao Shih Yen Chiu (A Thorough Investigation into Chinese Islamic History) by Chin Chi-T'ang.

Chung Wai Chiao T'ung Shih K'o Ming Chu Ts'ung Shu T'ang Sung Yuan Shih Tai Chung Hsi T'ung Shang Shih (The History of Commercial Intercourse between China and Western Nations during the T'ang, Sung, & Yuan Dynasties) by Kuwabara, Tr. by Fung Yu.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, Articles "China" by M. Hartmann and "Masdjid" by Ernest Diez.

Islam in China, by Marshall Broomhall.

Friends of Moslems; the Quarterly News Letter of the Society of Friends of the Moslems in China.

Chinese Moslem Chronology, by I. Mason in *North China Branch Royal Asiatic Society Journal,* Vol. LXII, 1931.

The Mohammedans of China: When and How They first Came, by I. Mason, in *NCBRAS Journal,* Vol. LX, 1929.

Early Moslem Leaders in China, in MOSLEM WORLD, Vol. XXVI, July 1936.

Ancient Accounts of India and China, by two Mohammedan Travelers in 9th Century, Trans. by Eusebius Renaudot.

The Renaissance of Islam, by Adam Mez, Trans. by Salahuddin, Khuda Bukhsh and D. S. Margoliouth.

METHODS OF WORK IN ALGERIA

To bring to the Muslim population a more adequate knowledge of Christ and to lead them to be followers of Him has ever been the avowed objective of missionary effort in Algeria. To this end various methods have been employed, depending upon the divers characteristics of the population, upon the qualifications and interests of missionaries and upon conditions and circumstances.

Direct evangelism. Following in the footsteps of early missionaries, many today emphasize the direct approach to the Muslim with the message of the Gospel, that is, by direct evangelism. Public preaching for the most part is not feasible, but the evangelist may hold meetings in mission halls, talk to gatherings in private homes, engage in conversation in cafés, markets and other public places. Furthermore, classes for children in private homes or mission halls, while often maintaining a varied program, serve the same purpose. The message itself constitutes the driving motive and the central theme. Some of our most faithful native evangelists today are men who have been won to Christ in this way.

Visitation in Muslim homes. Women missionaries, after having won the esteem and confidence of the indigenous population, may obtain entrance into Muslim homes, particularly in times of illness, misfortune or special need. While ministering to a sick child or giving a word of advice or of good cheer to a sorrowful mother, they have the opportunity to speak of the Great Physician and the Light of the world who dispels all darkness of mind and soul. Whatever the action performed or the word spoken, the primary purpose and hope is that Christ may be exalted.

Healing. Medical service as a type of missionary endeavor has not been developed in Algeria as in many other lands, the chief reason being, perhaps, that with French colonization have come French doctors of recognized competence. To be sure, the cities receive the greatest share of medical advantages. Yet the smaller villages and the rural areas in general may now receive some measure of medical service. Furthermore every large city has its hospital which serves both the indigenous and the European population of the entire region. In most cities are also found free clinics and other public health agencies.

Yet in remote rural areas, in the mountains, on the high plateaux and in the desert, as well as in urban centers, there are many gaps in medical care which cannot possibly be filled by present facilities. Such gaps constitute a challenge to Missions, for the need in terms of human suffering is great. Up to the present a reply to this challenge has been given by only a few individual missionaries more or less qualified to render a limited medical service at their local stations. Several medical dispensaries are maintained by Mission agencies, under the supervision of trained nurses and sometimes with the collaboration of local French doctors.

By these simple means many hundreds, and even thousands in the course of a year, receive relief from physical suffering and some comfort of body, mind and soul through the loving ministration of devoted servants.

Social service. Frequently human needs are of a very general nature. The home of a missionary living among the people assumes the character of a social settlement house where men, women and children of the neighborhood come seeking solutions for their grave and petty problems and soliciting succor for their various wants. A poor woman complains of a pain in her back. A man who has divorced his wife some six months previously comes bewailing his inability to get along without her. A young man is looking for work. A father of five children who has come from the country in hopes of finding a liveli-

hood has no means of subsistence. A woman gravely ill should go to the hospital, but needs someone to help her to secure admittance. A six-year-old boy needs a birth certificate for registration in a public school. A baby needs clothing, and the young mother should have instruction. Such seemingly ordinary problems are of immense importance to the persons involved, and the missionary solicited is expected to find a solution.

In spite of serious efforts on the part of the French government to provide public instruction for every child, indigenous as well as European, there are many, girls particularly, who for one reason or another are deprived of an education. Children have much free time, especially during vacations. Consequently the neighborhood house provides classes where children may receive some elementary instruction, learn hand work, engage in recreational activities, and receive moral and religious training.

A few mission stations engage in carpet making, blanket weaving, embroidery, basketry, sewing and similar arts as a means of social uplift in the interest especially of women and girls. Such occupations are called for by definite human needs which must be met in a practical way and in the spirit of Christian sympathy.

Literature. Missionaries in Algeria have always believed that the masses of the people should have the Christian Scriptures in their own tongues. A translation of the New Testament into colloquial Arabic, the tongue used by the majority of the population, was begun by a pioneer missionary over thirty years ago and remains yet to be completed, although portions of it have been published.

The Bible has been translated into the Kabyle tongue by another pioneer missionary among the Kabyles, one of the Berber tribes living in the mountainous regions of northern Algeria, and portions of it have been published.

A translation of the New Testament in the Chaouia dialect is under way, this tongue being used by the Chaouias, another of the Berber tribes inhabiting the

Aurès Mountains in the interior of the Department of Constantine. It must be remembered that the Berbers have never developed a literature in their own tongue.

Illiteracy is widespread. It is true that many young Muslims have received a certain degree of French Education, for the French government has sincerely endeavored to bring the benefits of modern schools to the indigenous population in both rural areas and urban centers. Yet outside of the urban environment, and even within the cities themselves, Arabic or one of the Berber tongues is the common language. Literary Arabic is read by relatively few.

Problems confronting the missionary in this respect are, therefore, first, the production of Scriptures and other suitable Christian literature in the language of the people; second, the elimination of illiteracy, a task which may take generations; third, the distribution of the Bible and Christian literature among the entire population, indigenous and European. That such distribution is effective cannot be denied. Quite recently missionaries made the acquaintance of a reading Muslim who, through a reading of the Bible alone, without the intervention of any Christian, became convinced of the truth of what he read and openly confessed himself to be a follower of Christ.

Homes for Muslim children. Conditions of poverty induced early missionaries to take a special interest in unfortunate children. This concern led to the founding of small homes for Arab and Kabyle boys and girls, several of which are now maintained in Algiers, Constantine and Kabylia. Children, for the most part of Muslim parentage, are brought when quite young by friends or relatives. They are provided with all the necessities of life, educated in the French schools, given Christian instruction and cared for in every way until they are able to assume personal responsibility for their own lives as useful and respectable men and women. Although these institutions are openly Christian, they receive the esteem and respect of the Muslim population which, after several decades of

contact with Christian Missions, is finally beginning to understand the purely religious motive underlying such activities.

There are now in Algeria scores of young Christians who have received the Light and caught the vision of a new life while in these homes. They are engaged in various occupations; some are teachers, some nurses, some tradesmen, some in offices, some soldiers. They are known as Christians wherever they go. They confess it frankly and they manifest it by attitude and conduct. A soldier who had been raised in one of these homes, on being questioned regarding his life in the army, said, "I am doing my best to live as a Christian."

Churches. The saying of Jesus, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20), constitutes a source of spiritual strength for the small groups of Christians who have been "called out" of their old life to enjoy a new fellowship in the name of Christ. Here and there, especially about centers where missionaries have labored longest, are small bands, mere handfuls, professing openly to be followers of Christ, gathering together in worship in His name, and revealing on the part of some a real desire to win others to their faith. Such modest beginnings are harbingers of a new Church which is to be.

Several years ago a group of nearly one hundred indigenous Christians of Algeria assembled in Kabylia for a few days of fellowship and mutual inspiration under the leadership of men of their own numbers. On this occasion many felt for the first time the spirit of solidarity and unity binding together individuals into one body.

The question now arises whether small groups of Christians should foster a separate and distinctive indigenous Church, or be assimilated with larger groups of French Christians, such as for example, the French Reformed Church which operates in every large city, or a Mission Church for both Europeans and natives. There are advantages and disadvantages with either choice, and

as the indigenous community grows the problem becomes more acute.

What are the real motives which constitute both the characteristic theme and the impelling energy of all effort? In one phrase, the answer is "loving service."

Negatively, love excludes all idea of self-satisfaction. Surely it is not for personal gratification that one spends his life among these people, facing apparently insurmountable obstacles and often brought down to despair through cares and difficulties. Were self-satisfaction the dominant motive, certainly one's perseverance would rapidly reach its limit and patience would cease altogether, resulting in utter futility and defeat. Moreover, to suppose that the motive is other-worldly merit, as has often been charged, is to misunderstand the purpose entirely.

Love also excludes striving to build up the Church as the prime objective. This is not meant to disparage the Church as such. The Church grows from the life that is from within, according to the measure of the spirit of love which animates it. An external structure without this inner motive can be no more than a perishable shell. Assuredly narrow sectarianism here finds no quarter.

Love likewise excludes purposing to defend the cause of Christ by our own achievements. His cause, put to the test, vindicates itself. Our part is love. He who lacks this, and attempts to champion Christ's cause, swiftly discovers himself unarmed and helpless. Finally, if not immediately, the Muslim learns to discern the purity of motives.

Affirmatively, love implies that life is motivated and directed by our love for Christ. Christ's way has become our way because we love Him. Were He with us today as with the disciples of old, He would speak and we would obey out of love. We may go still farther and say with John, "We love, because He first loved us" (I John 4:19).

Furthermore, love takes into its scope all mankind. The missionary is inspired by a love for his fellowmen, beginning with his colleagues and those in the adjoining

house. Why spend one's self in acts of kindness? Why go to heal that little child or poor mother? Why go out of one's way to find employment for a young man or sustenance for a father with five children? Why devote years and expend money to help Muslim children? There is only one answer, love for them. This is the impelling motive.

Genuine love expresses itself in deeds of service. Kind sentiments alone with regard to the Muslim are not sufficient. To serve may imply doing what is disagreeable, humiliating one's self to do what others would despise, suffering inconveniences, persevering in face of misunderstandings.

Loving service is the bridge spanning the chasm of misconceptions and suspicions which have for so many centuries separated Muslims from Christians. Loving service will finally break down the wall of ill-will and prejudices which have already too long barred the way to human brotherhood.

All those who with pure motives teach, preach, guide, heal, comfort and serve are leading the Muslim to a more adequate knowledge of Christ.

Hartford, Conn. ELMER H. DOUGLAS.

GREGORY OF TATHEW'S "CONTRA MOHAMMEDANOS"

Through the courtesy of the Rev. Terenig Poladian I have had the loan for some days of the scarce and little-known work of Bishop Babgen Kuleserian, which contains the only available text of an unusually interesting tractate *Contra Mohammedanos,* by the XIVth Century Armenian theologian and polemist, Grigor Tathewatsi.[1] Although the Armenian people came early into touch with the Muslims as the latter pressed into the eastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire, and the Armenian historians give some account of these Muslim conquests, which accounts, incidentally, deserve more attention than they have hitherto received from writers on the history of the Caliphate, it is curious that we have to wait till the XIVth Century before we come upon any Armenian writer who really knows Islam and undertakes serious consideration of the Muslim polemic against Christianity.

As early as 750 we have John of Damascus, in the Byzantine Church, replying to the claims of the "Ishmaelites," and showing a very good knowledge of the Qur'ān and of the Islamic system,[2] while his pupil Theodore Abū Qurra (c. 825) wrote both in Greek and in Arabic against ὁ μεμηνὼς τῶν Ἀγαρηνῶν ψευδοπροφήτης Μωάμεθ,[3] while in the succeeding centuries Bartholomew of Edessa,[4]

[1] *Islame hay matenagrouthian metj: (A) Grigori Tathewatswoy endeem Tačkats; (B) i khašounē; ousoumnasirets ew hratarakets Babgen Eps. Kiwleserian,* Vienna, 1930. Printed at the Mekhitarist Press.

[2] The two Dialogues between a Christian and a Saracen are printed in Migne *PG* XCIV 1585-98; XCVI, 1335-48. The substance of the dispute is summarized on pp. 158-160 of Joseph Langen's *Johannes von Damaskus,* (Gotha, 1879).

[3] The Greek text is in Migne *PG* XCVII, 1446 ff. For the Arabic tractates see G. Graf, *Die arabischen Schriften des Theodor Abu Qurra,* (Paderborn, 1910), and A. Guillaume, "A Debate between Christian and Moslem Doctors," in the *Centenary Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* (London, 1924) pp. 233-244.

[4] Bartholomew's date is disputed. Palmieri, *Die Polemik des Islam,* p. 20 puts him in the VIIIth Century, but Wolfgang Eichner in *Der Islam* XXIII (1936) p. 137 thinks he must have lived in the XIIIth Century. His polemical works are to be found in Migne *PG* CIV, 1383-1458.

and Samona, Bishop of Gaza,[5] (1056) take up and argue with some vigour against the claims of the Saracens and their rejection of the Christian teaching. The Monophysite Patriarch John of Antioch, is said to have held a dispute with the Muslim commander as early as 639,[6] and Abū Nūḥ of Anbār (c. 810),[7] the Nestorian Patriarch Timothy (c. 823),[8] and the Jacobites Ibn Zur'ah and Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib,[9] have left important tractates on the Muslim question, not to mention the now well-known Apology of al-Kindī.[10]

Among the Armenians, however, the early references to Islam deal as much in fable as do those of Latin ecclesiastical writers of the Middle Ages. Armenian writers know tales of the monkish mentor who supplied Muḥammad with the materials for his "revelations," of the demons who tormented the Prophet, of the idols at the Meccan sanctuary, etc., but show no real acquaintance with actual Muslim writings, save in the case of Ghevond (Leontius), a historian of the VIIIth Century,[11] who tells of the Arab invasions, and incidentally gives in full what purports to be the reply of the Emperor Leo III (the

---

[5] His dialogue on Transsubstantiation with the Saracen Aḥmad is printed in Migne, *PG*, CXX, 821-833.

[6] The Syriac text of this discussion was published by Nau in *Journal asiatique* for 1915, p. 248 ff., and it is discussed by Mingana in the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society* for 1916, p. 35 ff.

[7] For his Refutation of the Qur'ān see Assemani *Bibliotheca Orientalis* III, i, 212.

[8] Timothy's discussion was held before the Caliph al-Mahdī in 781 or 782 (Assemani *Bib. Orien.* III, i, 162), but its Arabic original has been lost, (see, however, Cheikho in *al-Machriq* XIX, 359-374, 408-418). Several MSS of the Syriac text of it are now known, and one of them was published in facsimile by Mingana in *Woodbrooke Studies* II, 1 (Cambridge, 1928).

[9] Abū'l-Khair b. aṭ-Ṭayyib wrote a *Risālah* refuting the Muslim charge that Christians believe in three gods. It is printed as No. XVIII of Paul Sbath's *Vingt Traités philosophiques et apologétiques d'auteurs arabes*, Cairo, 1929.
Abū 'Alī 'Īsā b. Isḥāq b. Zur'ah (d. 1007) has a *Risālah* discussing Muslim objections to the Trinity and the Incarnation, and examining their claims as to the Prophetic mission of Muḥammad. It is printed as No. III in Sbath's *Vingt Traités*.

[10] Arabic text London, 1880. Sir Wm. Muir *The Apology of al-Kindi*, London, 1882.

[11] Chahnazarian in his French translation of Ghevond (Paris, 1856) calls him "écrivain du VIIIe siècle," and this is accepted by Petermann in *ZDMG* XV (1861) p. 398, but C. F. Neumann in his *Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur*, (Leipzig, 1836) p. 129 lists him among the writers of the Xth Century. Mekhitar of Airivankh of the XIIIth Century, in his *Chronological History* quotes Ghevond as an earlier Armenian historian, but does not give his date, and Stephen of Taron Asoghik (992-1115) in his *World History* mentions him as one of the authors he had used for the period of the Arab invasions, but again does not date him. In his account of the battle of Arjish (*Cf.* Balādhurī *Futūḥ*, 200), about the year 771, Ghevond seems to be quoting from eye-witnesses what they told him, which would mean that he must have lived sometime in the eighth century, and this would seem to be supported by the fact that his work ends on the year 788. The colophon to the text tells us that Ghevond's work was written at the command of the Lord Shāpūh of Bagratuni, and this, if correct, would support the early date, since the Bagratid Shāpūh is said to have died in the IXth Century.

Isaurian) to a letter from 'Umar II, calling on him to become a Muslim, a reply in which Leo refutes in detail the usual Islamic claims, and incidentally gives some exceedingly interesting information as to how Islam was regarded by the Eastern Church of that century—if the document really belongs to that age.[12] It is not till we reach the XIVth Century, however, that we find an Armenian ecclesiastical writer who has any real acquaintance with Islam.

Grigor Tathewatsi (1340-1410), for many years Abbot of the Monastery of Eustathius or Tathew (Dathev), and one of the most strenuous of that body who strove by word of mouth and pen to resist Roman encroachments in the areas of the Armenian Church,[13] wrote in 1397, at the request of a certain monk named Adam, a *Book of Questions,* in which in the form of question and answer he undertakes to expose the errors of Jews, Manichaeans, Muḥammadans, and the various heretical Christian sects, on the questions of the Creation, the Creation of man, the Incarnation of the Word of God, the end of the World, and Final Judgment. This work has been used by Western scholars mainly for the sake of its section on the Manichaeans. In the selections from this work published by Bishop Petros Astapattsi at Constantinople in 1729, and in the edition published the following year (1730) with Preface and Indices by Baghdasar, the whole chapter *Contra Mohammedanos* was omitted, doubtless to avoid difficulties with the Turkish authorities in Constantinople, who might not have been kindly disposed towards a com-

[12] Theophanes mentions 'Umar's letter to Leo (*Chronographia,* ed. de Boor, I, 399), and the reference is repeated in Cedrenus (Bonn, 1838) I, 792. It seems not to be mentioned by any Muslim writer, however, though we have ample evidence in them of 'Umar's letters to other potentates summoning them to embrace Islam, and Balādhurī *Futūḥ* 133 actually mentions his letter to the Greek commander about the year 100 A.H. on the question of ransoming the Muslims captured at Latakiyya. Several Christian writers mention Leo's reply. Agapius in the *Kitāb al-'Unwān* (*PO* VIII, 502-503) tells how he refuted the perversity of 'Umar's doctrine and demonstrated the light of Christianity, Michael Syrus mentions it (ed. Chabot, 488, 489), and so do the Armenian writers Thomas Ardzrouni (ed. St. Petersburg, 1887, p. 105), Kyriakos (ed. Venice, 1805, p. 37) and Vartan (in Muyldermans, *La Domination arabe en Armenie,* p. 101), though these may all be dependent on Ghevond. In Migne's *PG* CVII, 315-324 there is a Latin summary of a reply to the Saracen 'Umar included among the works of Leo VI, the Philosopher, but apparently the only full text of what was supposed to be Leo's reply is that preserved in this work of Ghevond.

[13] See Neumann *Versuch,* p. 215.

munity which published a book containing a refutation of the errors of the Muslim religion.

It so happens that there are numerous MSS of this *Book of Questions,* for its subject matter attracted readers with a taste for disputation, and so it was very frequently copied. It was while living in Constantinople in the years 1905-06, and engaged in editing there the Armenian weekly paper *Lois* (*Light*), that Mgr. Babgen Kuleserian had occasion to look up a quotation from Grigor Tathewatsi, and not finding it in the printed edition, turned to the MSS available in Constantinople, where he discovered this whole chapter that had been omitted. It was still not politic to publish it there at that time, but after having collated his copy made from the Constantinople MSS with other MSS in the Library of the Monastery of St. James at Jerusalem, he published it with the Mekhitarists at Vienna in 1930, as the first part of three on *Islam in Armenian Literature.*

The suppressed chapter is actually called "Against the Tačiks," which might have been interpreted as "Against the Turks," since Tačik is commonly used for "Turk" in Armenian writings, though in the Armenian Bible it is the word used in II Macc. XII, 10 to translate Ἀράβες, which is probably the original meaning of the word, since it seems to be derived ultimately from the Arab tribe of Ṭaiy,[14] and thence came to mean Muḥammadan, or any people, such as the Turks, who profess the religion of Islam. In M. Kuleserian's edition the word has been changed at the heads of the chapters to *Ailazgi,* a word properly meaning "foreigner," i.e., one of another country, race or creed. The sixteen "errors" of the Muḥammadans which are discussed are:

I. *Their Denial of the Trinity.*

Like Sabellius they insist that God must be one and cannot be a Trinity, for all procreation engenders corrup-

[14] It will be remembered that *Ṭayyâyê* from this tribe of Ṭaiy came to be the common word for "Arabs" in Edessene Syriac, and *Tāzik* in Middle Iranian, meaning "Arab" is the source of the Turkish *Tāzik* (*Tāžik*), which came to mean "Muslim" as one who professed the religion of the Arabs. The Armenian word came probably direct from Iranian, (Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik,* p. 86).

tion, and if God had a son that would entail His being involved in corruption, which is unthinkable. Moreover, everything born is involved in temporality, for it is the passing from one stage to another, whereas God is eternal and outside the time process, so the son as born could not be God. Also if the son partakes of the Father's nature, he takes something from God, which means division, and so there would be two gods. If the Father has given His Person to the son, then the son is not a person other than the Father; but persons, if they are real persons, are always different, as Peter, Paul and Mark are three men, not one.

The answer to all these points is one and the same, viz., that we are dealing with a spiritual nature and not a physical or human nature, and in this spiritual nature birth would not involve corruption nor division nor the passing from one stage to another. In such a spiritual nature we have the union of three in one as, on a different level, spirit soul and body are one man, or as fire is one with its light and heat, or the flower is one with its colour and odour, these being distinct and discernably distinct, but yet the whole being one not many.

II. *Their teaching that God is the author of evil as well as good.*

They do not go so far as Mani and claim that there are two gods, one who created good and one who created evil, but they make the one Creator the author of both evil and good. Christians deny that God has created evil, and claim that He is the author of good only, teaching this for the following five reasons:

i. Good is existential, for all that is good exists, and all that exists is good; but evil is something acquired and does not exist in itself. So since God is the Creator of existence not of non-existence, He cannot be the Creator of evil.

ii. Evil is occasional and intrusive, so if God created evil He would be the creator of the occasional and intrusive, which is absurd.

iii. If God created evil He must love evil; so He would have to love evil-doers who spend their lives doing the evil that He loves. This is even more absurd.

iv. If God were the creator of evil then He ought not to punish Satan for doing evil, and since He punishes evil He cannot have been its creator.

v. If God had created evil, evil would be of Him. But God is good—the pure, innate, essential good, which must always be, and this does not permit of evil being of Him.

Against this the Muslims argue that before God created the world He saw it such as it is, and as it is it contains good and evil, therefore God must have created both. We reply that it is true that God sees all from the beginning to the end more perfectly than man could see, but to foresee the appearance of evil is not to will it. The will of God, they say, is absolute, and man can do nothing against this will, therefore, if man does evil it must be done in accordance with the will of God. We reply that it is true that we can do nothing against the will of God, but of His will He gives us free will, which means that our freedom of choice is according to His will, but not what we choose, for that is according to our will and we may choose evil.

If God is not the cause of evil, they say, then someone else is, and so we have two first causes, as in the teaching of Mani. But evil, as we have already seen, is something acquired, not something existential, and so there are not two Creators. If our will, they say, decides on evil, it was God who created our will, therefore He as the creator of that which decided for evil is really the cause of that evil. This, however, fails to note the important distinction that while the will is the creation of God, the choice is left to man. God wished him to choose good, but if he decides to choose evil God cannot prevent him, for to interfere with him would ruin the power of choice which God had given him. If God is not the author of evil, they say, then why did He say—"I will harden Pharaoh's heart"? To which we reply that God does no

one an injustice, and if He seems to do evil that is only that to our limited knowledge it appears evil. The Bible, they say, declares that we follow the path that is traced for us, and this must be true of the wicked as well as of the good, but who other than God traced that path of the wicked? We answer that it is true that a path is traced for us, but the good arrive while the wicked are condemned, which shows that while there is predestination yet each is free in his acts. God, they say, has created men and animals, some good and some evil, so both good and evil are the work of God. But, we answer, by birth all are good, it is only later that some become evil, so that as to creation, God is the creator only of good. Why, they ask, has God created some men rich, masters and governors, while others are poor, servants and the governed, which is an injustice, and proves that evil comes from God. We reply that there are distinctions among men that some may profit from others, and that is good not evil; and all, of whatsoever class, if they walk according to the will of God will be saved. Moreover we shall demonstrate that God cannot be the author of evil for the following ten reasons:

i. Otherwise the promise of recompense for the good and chastisement for the wicked would be vain.

ii. All recompense would be unjust.

iii. God would be the cause of all our ills.

iv. Hope and prayer would be useless.

v. This would destroy our free will, which we find ever leading us to two paths of choice.

vi. We should no longer be able to praise the good and blame the wicked.

vii. Virtues, whether human or divine, would no longer exist.

viii. All exhortations to do good and avoid evil would be in vain.

ix. Paradise and Hell would be superfluous.

x. All Laws, natural, human and moral, would be but lies, for these all bid us flee from evil and do good.

III. *Their Denial of the Incarnation.*

They deny the Incarnation because they say that the birth of the God-man would make God mutable and material. But it was not the mutable and material that incarnated, but the immutable Word. The soul unites with the body to make a normal man, without thereby becoming itself material or suffering any change in its nature; so the immaterial, immutable Word became flesh without itself becoming thereby material or mutable. It is undignified, they say, for God to inhabit the material and corruptible. But there is no question here of dignity, any more than there is when a constructor dwells in what he has constructed. God created all the world, which is full of matter and corruption, yet He dwells within His universe, so why should it be undignified for Him to dwell in one particular portion thereof?

Just as good, they say, cannot unite itself with evil, so the greatness of God could not unite itself with the feebleness of man. But in union there is no confusion, so human frailty would not diminish the greatness of God; rather the feeble human nature would be improved by the union. But God's mercy, they say, is greater than His justice, so He ought to provide for expiation by His mercy without the necessity of making a God-man. We say, however, that His justice and His mercy must exist together. God, they say, could have saved man merely by so willing it, or He might have saved him by some other, so that there was no necessity for the incarnation. We agree that God *might* have accomplished this end by some other means, had He so willed, but the incarnation was necessary in order that He might show His love for us, and that He might provide someone with the immense power necessary to bring about our salvation. Sin, they say, cannot be expiated by another sin, and it was a great sin to put Christ to death. Sin can only be expiated by repentance, and this man could have accomplished without the creation of a God-man and His death. We reply that repentance and

good-works only avail if they are accompanied by faith in Christ, and how could there be faith in Him if He had not come? If the man-God is the sole means of our redemption, they ask, why did His incarnation not take place at the beginning of things in our world? We answer that God gave man from the beginning the law of nature, and then the written Law, to cause him to flee from sin, but only when it appeared that these were not sufficient did God send the incarnate Saviour. Finally, they state that it is unseemly to speak of Father and Son in relation to God. Our answer is that in the Old Testament God Himself uses the terms "father" and "son" in speaking of His relations with men, so there can be nothing unseemly in our using those terms with regard to His relation to the incarnate Son of Man.

IV. *Their Denial that Christ is God.*

They declare that Christ was only a Prophet, though the Scriptures plainly speak of Him as God. Since our word is not man, they say, no more can the Word of God be God, forgetting that our word is create but the Word of God is uncreate, and as a candle lit from a light is itself a light in that limited form, so the immaterial light of God was born in a materialized form from the Virgin's womb, and was Himself God. Christ performed miracles, they say, just like the other Prophets; knew secret things as did other Prophets; was rejected of his people, like other Prophets; died and had his soul go to heaven just as other Prophets, and even was able to take his physical body to heaven as did Enoch and Elijah; and thus he was in all respects one of the Prophet band. Yes, we reply, He was a Prophet, but they have omitted the other evidence which shows that He was much more than a Prophet. Christ, they say, will come back to earth for the last Judgment, and then will die as other men. We know that He will come for the Final Judgment, but it is He then who will be the Judge. Having come once to preach and convert, He will come again to judge and to redeem.

V. *Their Refusal to recognize the Old and the New Testaments.*

The Tačiks recognize only four books of Scripture, the *Taurat* which is the Book of Moses, i.e., the Pentateuch; the *Zabūr,* which is the Book of David, i.e., the Psalter; the *Injīl* which is the Book of Jesus, i.e., the Gospels, and the *Furqān* which is the Book of Muḥammad, i.e., the Qur'ān. Though they recognize these four they accept but one, viz., the Furqān, so we ask why, if theirs is true, and the others being likewise revelation, also true, they accept only one and treat the other three as mere lies? In reply they say that God did not reveal the truth in the first books and so gave a final book containing the truth, or that He changed His first words and so set them forth in a new and final form, or that He gave mere illusions in the former books, but revealed the truth in their book. All this is calumny on God. We cannot imagine that He would ever act in this fashion. As a matter of fact when we look into the Furqān we find there that it has for the most part copied what was in the previous books, so that if they are false and illusions it is equally so. They also pretend that the laws in the former books are old and out of date and changed, whereas they have the newest set of laws. We admit that when that which is perfect is come that which was imperfect passes away, and so the New Testament is a more perfect expression of the truth that the Old, but we look in vain in their law for anything superperfect.

VI. *Their Claim that Muḥammad was a Prophet.*

To be a Prophet means to know the past, to predict the future, and to speak of the present in all truth. Now Muḥammad was ignorant of the past, as we see from the mistakes he makes with regard to the histories of Abraham and his predecessors. He had nothing to say in prediction of the future, and he was totally ignorant of things present to him, for he believed that 'Alī was the son of his wife.[15]

[15] 'Alī was the cousin of the Prophet, being the son of Abū Ṭālib. In the *Sīra* we read of how Muḥammad adopted 'Alī, then a lad of five or six years, to console himself for the loss of his son al-Qāsim, and that from that time 'Alī never left him (see Ṭabarī *Annales* I, 1163; Ibn Hishām, 159), and it may be that this adoption, whereby 'Alī would be called the "son" of Muḥammad, led to the strange idea of our author.

A Prophet, we know, exists for the sake of others, not for himself, as we see illustrated in the life of Moses and of many others. But all that Muḥammad did was for himself, declaring that God had created the universe for him. All the Prophets declared themselves by signs and miracles to get their message accepted, but this Muḥammad got his accepted, like a tyrant, by threats and force and murder. From the writings we see that each of the Prophets brought a message appropriate to his times and circumstances, but Muḥammad brought nothing new for the times, merely copying some things from Moses, some from others, and adding his own signature at top and bottom. Prophets do not contradict themselves, but Muḥammad is full of contradictions. They ask why we have not the name of their Prophet written in our Scriptures. We answer that these Scriptures were written seven centuries before his day, and the Prophets and Apostles warned us that there would be heretics arising who would deceive the faithful, about whom we were to write nothing. The truth is that Muḥammad the son of 'Abdallah, knowing a little about the laws of Moses, became in the desert the disciple of the hermit Bahira,[16] who was himself a disciple of Arius, and taught laws contrary to the commandments both old and new, making the world obey his law by violence.

VII. *Their idea that the Resurrection is Material.*

They look for a material resurrection after which will be feastings, sexual enjoyments, indulgence in pleasures and voluptuousness, all things which the Holy Scriptures prohibit and condemn. By the resurrection, they say, we regain Paradise, and as in the first Paradise there was marriage as the primary joy, so in the Paradise regained there will be women and marriage. To which we reply that in the resurrection there will be neither marriage nor giving in marriage, but we shall be as the angels. We remember that in the earthly Paradise Adam and Eve

[16] This is the familiar Baḥīra legend found in Byzantine, Syriac and Armenian writers. See Gottheil "A Christian Bahira Legend" in *ZA* XIII and XIV (1898, 1899), and the essay in *From Pyramids to Paul* (1935), pp. 106 ff.

were as the angels, and it was only after they were driven out that God said to them "Increase and multiply in the earth," and "in the earth" is not in Paradise. Is it not written in the Scriptures, they ask, that at the resurrection there shall be in Paradise repose, and oil and honey for eating and drinking? and did not Christ after His resurrection eat and drink with His disciples? and is it not true that the body needs nourishment, so that if the body is raised nourishment will still be necessary for it to live and enjoy Paradise? We answer that when God says in Scripture "the heaven is My throne and the earth My footstool," these words are figurative and not literal, and the eating and drinking of Paradise are figurative expressions for enjoying the knowledge and wisdom of God, for the resurrection body we shall have will not be of perishable flesh which needs physical nourishment, but like the angels will be imperishable and immortal. The case of Christ's eating before the disciples was not because He had any need of food, but as a certification that it was really He and not a mere vision.

They say that in Paradise every man will be given from forty to seventy women, but there can be only as many resurrections as there are deaths, and among the humans who die there are more men than women, for many men as we all know have to go without wives all their life, so how will it be possible in Paradise to give each man so many women? They say that there will be pleasure but no childbirth in Paradise. Now we know that good men use women for procreation of children, but evil men use them merely for purposes of fornication and prostitution, so they would have us believe that in Paradise it is all fornication and prostitution. They say there will be much eating and drinking in Paradise, but Paradise is not on earth it is in the heaven, and the four elements out of which things good to eat and drink are composed belong to earth, whereas in heaven is only the fifth element, so how can their claim be true?

VIII. *Their Belief that Souls and Angels are mortal.*

All created things, they say, have a beginning and an end. Men and angels are created beings, and therefore their souls, which had a beginning, will have an end, and thus are mortal not immortal. This, we reply, is to miss the distinction of classes of being. God is uncreate and immortal. Souls, whether of angels or men, are created but immortal. All else is created and mortal. Souls are created in the image of God, and are thus immortal. God created them for His own glory, so if they are but mortal, then His glory is not eternal. Moreover, have they not thought that if the soul is mortal there could be no resurrection, for the soul would perish as the body does.

IX. *Their Condemnation of the Cross and holy Images.*

Because of the Cross and the holy Images they accuse us of idolatry, not perceiving the inner meaning, like an ignorant fellow who thinks that the letters written on the page are the sense. The written letters which are material only serve to reveal the sense, and so the Cross and the Images which are of wood or metal or stone, and carved in such and such forms, only serve to set forth the inner meaning. We do not adore the matter of the Cross but the power of Christ crucified. Do they not know that the difference between our images and those of idolaters is that the power behind our images is that of God, while that behind the images of the idolators is the Devil? God created man in His own image, so if God can make an image of Himself it is not wrong for us to make an image of Him. God shewed Himself in human form to Abraham, to Moses, to Daniel, to Isaiah, to Ezekiel, so it cannot be wrong for us to picture Him in human form. The Word of God left His image on a handkerchief and sent a picture of Himself to King Abgar to cure him of his disease,[17] so it cannot be wrong for us to make images of Him. But did not Scripture forbid the making of

[17] The image on the handkerchief probably refers to the legend of St. Veronica. For the picture sent to Abgar of Edessa see the Syriac *Doctrine of Addai*, though there the picture is made by Hannan on his own initiative and brought to Abgar.

images? they ask, saying that man must not make for himself any graven image of anything that is in the heaven above or on the earth beneath. This prohibition, we reply, was to keep the people from the sin of idolatry, and was in force before the Incarnation, but since the Word Himself took flesh it is no longer in force. They reproach us also for our turning to the East and kneeling in our prayer, but do they not themselves turn to the south and adore the House of Ishmael at Mecca?

X. *Their making no choice in foods, but eating everything save Pork.*

God, both in the laws of nature and in the laws of Moses has marked a distinction between clean and unclean beasts. Also among birds and fish there is this distincton, and since in the law of Moses there is a list of such, we observe this, and eat only of such as are clean. But they eat of all kinds save pork, recognizing no law either natural or revealed save on this point. They say that the Prophet bade them do so, but while we find the prohibition of swine we do not find any command of Muḥammad about eating the flesh of horses, foxes or wolves, of hares and of camels. They condemn our use of wine because they say it is the source of many evils. We reply that the horse also is the cause of many evils, since wars, rapine and pillage cannot be accomplished without its aid, yet they do not make that a reason for not eating of it.

XI. *Their condemnation of Wine as forbidden.*

In condemning wine as illicit Muḥammad is in contradiction with all other Prophets, which is proof that he was not a prophet. It is not wine itself that is evil, but excess in its use is evil, for that engenders drunkenness, which in its turn gives rise to much harm both to body and soul, for it brutalizes the intelligence, excites sexual desires which lead to fornication, murder and many other evil things. Thus drunkenness is forbidden, and no drunkard shall inherit the Paradise of God. Wine is good, it is

its effects that are evil, as the matter of a sword is good, but when it is used for murder or assassination its effects are evil. Wine is very useful. It dissipates sadness, cures sickness, fortifies the body, and was used by the ancient saints and holy men mentioned in Scripture.

XII. *Their Imagination that Ablution will Efface their Sins.*

Water purifies the body, but does not purify the soul, since the soul is spiritual and cannot be cleansed by what cleanses the material. They, however, are diligent at ablutions, and say that since the corporeal body puts sin on the incorporeal soul, then cleansing of the body ought also to cleanse the soul. We reply that it is the soul which drives the body to sin, and the soul cannot be reached by ablutions. They point to our practice of baptism, but baptism is not alone of the body, for in it the Holy Spirit purifies the soul. Moreover baptism is by the hand of another, whereas they wash themselves in ablution, so that there is no transference of grace. If ablution does not cleanse from sin, they say, then ablution is useless. To which we reply that ablution is good from a hygienic point of view, but has no moral effect of itself, otherwise frogs, which are always in the water, would be morally the purest of beings.

XIII. *Their Practice of Circumcision.*

They condemn us because we do not practice circumcision, a rite which was given to Abraham and ought to be followed by all the children of Abraham. We reply that we are children of Abraham by faith, and it was his faith which was credited to him for righteousness, not his circumcision. But Christ Himself, they say, was circumcised, and therefore Christians who follow His example ought to follow Him in this. We answer that He was circumcised as a child as being under the Law, and to show that as incarnate He was really man, but when He gave us His own teaching He bade us to circumcise our hearts not our bodies. The Abyssinians, they say, who are

Christians, practise circumcision, according to the ancient law, and so ought all others. We reply that their circumcision is not to keep the ancient law, but because their country is unhealthy and circumcision is for them a hygienic measure. With us baptism replaces circumcision and is superior to it for the following reasons:

Baptism removes original sin, which circumcision does not.

Baptism opens the gates of heaven, which circumcision does not.

Baptism redeems us from eternal torment, which circumcision does not.

Baptism purifies both male and female, circumcision regards only the male.

Baptism is a spiritual and an eternal seal, whereas circumcision was only a corporeal and temporary seal.

XIV. *They do not Know the true Method of Fasting.*

They do not know either the Jewish or the Christian fast. They do not observe any distinction between the food that may be eaten during Lent and during Easter. We Christians fast during the day and at night eat only the foods proper to Lent, but in their fast they fast during the day and eat as they please at night. To us the fasting period is a period of spiritual recollection and an expiation for our sins, but to them the month of Ramaḍān, apart from the fast by day, is a month for the indulgence of all the senses.

XV. *Their Refusal to Eat of the Offering of Christians.*

Christians are uncircumcised, they say, and so their offering is unclean. We reply that Abel, and Noah and Abraham were likewise uncircumcised, but their offerings were acceptable to God, so that circumcision can have nothing to do with one's offering being clean or unclean. And why, we ask, if the offering of Christians is unclean and may not be eaten, do they eat of the grain which is sown and reaped by Christians?

XVI. *They are without Laws.*

They imagine that they have laws, but they have not. If we look at what they have we find a number of things taken over from the law of Moses, and a great deal else that is foolishness. If we allow this to be law then there is no distinction between belief and unbelief, between light and darkness.

Here ends Grigor Tathewatsi's treatment of the sixteen aberrations of the Tačiks, which is in effect his tractate *Contra Mohammedanos.* Some of the points that he brings up and treats are the well-known points of Muslim-Christian controversy met with in innumerable tractates, but some of his points are new, and perhaps it would be well if someone better versed in Armenian than the present writer would make a complete translation of the whole tractate,[18] with some illustrative commentary from other works in Armenian which deal with the Muslim controversy.

Columbia University,
New York City. ARTHUR JEFFERY.

[18] There is a fuller summary of the work by Fr. Macler in Cahier IV of Année 1932 of the *Revue des Etudes islamiques,* pp. 493-522, which may be used to supplement the brief statements of the arguments given here.

WESTERN MEDICINE IN IRAN

Ten centuries ago when America was still a savage wilderness, and even England a rather primitive land, Iran produced a great man, philosopher, scientist and physician, Avicenna, the exponent of the Arabic-Iranian system of medicine. His writings indicate a logical mind and acute powers of observation, and excellent deductive processes; for centuries his were the only text-books (of medicine) used in the universities of Europe.

With such a beginning, one might have expected that Iran would continue to advance in the scientific approach and the logical treatment of disease, but unfortunately, through the ages, medical progress and research moved westward, and Iran continued to use her tenth century medical knowledge and practice, even into the twentieth. This was due to many factors, economic, political, social and geographic, as well as to the teachings and practice of Islam, which did not encourage research and progress along scientific and educational lines.

Thus, the missionary entering Iran found medical practice a confused mixture of superstition and ignorance, tradition and primitive science. Diagnosis was based chiefly on examinaton of the pulse and the tongue, and treatment was empirical and often drastic. The "shotgun" prescription with its ten to fifteen ingredients, was common, with the forlorn hope that at least one of the drugs might aid in the recovery of the patient. The humoral theory held sway, and diseases were arbitrarily classified as "hot" or "cold" and not only the treatment but also the diet was dogmatically prescribed in accordance with this classification.

The old-fashioned "hakeem" had limited instruction

and few textbooks (some written in beautiful quatrains!) usually inheriting his scientific knowledge from the preceptor to whom he was attached as pupil and assistant. His surgical instruction was very elementary, and consisted in demonstrations of the opening of boils. Bloodletting, which was common, especially in the spring, was done by barbers and old women specialists, who made several superficial lacerations of the back, and then sucked vigorously at the small end of a goat's horn applied to the bleeding spot. The reduction of fractures was left to self-appointed bone-setters, whose knowledge of anatomy was usually limited, but who made up in power what they lacked in science. Obstetrics in this Moslem land was entirely in the hands (literally) of enthusiastic but ignorant midwives.

Therefore it is not surprising that the confused patient, noting the terrific morbidity and tragic mortality among those attended by the *hakeems,* often preferred to go to the local *mullah,* whose amulets were less nauseating than the doctor's complicated prescription, and just as effective! The anxious, loving mother, noting that her child was gradually getting worse under the *hakeem's* treatment, would go to the *mullah,* who, dipping his reed pen into the thick black ink, would write a verse of the Koran on a small bit of paper. This, the troubled mother would take home, dip in water and give it to the child to drink in the vain hope that thus the child might become well.

Sanitation was primitive (to put it politely!) and knowledge of hygiene was nil. Preventive medicine was unknown and thus in a land blessed with much sunshine, and with what should be a healthful climate, there was a disgraceful infant mortality, a terrible amount of disease and suffering.

When modern Christian missions came to Iran a century ago, there were no hospitals, clinics or dispensaries; epidemics were frequent, and much disease was endemic. Medical missions have been a definite part of the Christian program through the century. Commencing with small

dispensaries in the larger cities, supplemented by village itinerating, the program gradually expanded and hospitals were built, at first small and poorly equipped, but later larger and with modern diagnostic and surgical equipment.

The medical missionary realized his limitations as well as he sensed his opportunities, but he soon found that he must be prepared to handle all types of disease; he must be a "General Specialist" in every sense of that term. Often there were no dentists in the community, and he had to extract teeth; there were no veterinarians, and camels, cows and donkeys were brought to him for treatment! He had to learn to be all things to all men, and to four-footed creatures also.

There was no nursing profession, and some decades ago the first missionary nurse came out from the homeland to be a colleague to the medical missionary. She too found her duties many and varied, but soon found that she might multiply herself if she could train national nurses, and thus nurse-training was established, and many splendid girls have completed the course and are doing fine work in different cities of Iran. There are all too few of them however. The government started a nurse-training project some years ago, with which we endeavored to cooperate. It soon became evident that they wished a very brief course, without the detailed training which is needed so much.

The medical missionaries brought in not only modern diagnosis and surgery but they attacked special problems in which neither the government nor Iranian individuals had shown any interest. Sixteen years ago the first work for lepers was started in Meshed by medical missionaries from the American Christian hospital in that city; after some months Iranian laymen of Moslem faith asked if they too might not have a part in the work. They established a "Society against Leprosy" which built the first proper housing for lepers in all Iran. The government too has now been interested, and they are giving annual appropria-

tions (increasing each year) toward the care and treatment of the Iranian lepers. Several years ago a second leprosarium was erected in Tabriz to take care of lepers in north-western Iran.

At one time the mission hospitals were the only ones in the community, and the medical missionaries the only trained surgeons and physicians. It is very encouraging to note the rapid development of modern medicine in Iran in the past few years. Awakening from the lethargy of centuries, Iran is making splendid progress, as one would expect of a people of genuine culture and fine ancestry. The National Health Department has broadened its activities, and smallpox vaccination is now available in all parts of the land, and is compulsory for those wishing to enter school. The vaccine is prepared at the National Pasteur Institute in Teheran, which also prepares typhoid vaccine which is distributed by the Health Department, but which is used by all too few. Government hospitals and dispensaries have been established in various cities and towns, and free treatment is now available to many. Unfortunately, doctors of ability are still comparatively few, and the equipment as well as the personnel of some of the hospitals is decidedly below par, but they are a definite step forward.

The Government Medical School in Teheran is improving constantly, and although it would still be rated as a Class "C" school by our standards, it is turning out some very fine men. Under the old Islamic law, dissection of the human body, or autopsy was not permitted, and thus anatomy at the medical school was taught by books, charts and models. This was most unsatisfactory, and about six years ago, the former Shah, Riza Khan Pahlevi, ordered a modern dissecting room as part of the school equipment, and one of our American medical missionaries in Teheran was invited to start the department, which he did in a very splendid way. New bacteriology laboratories have also been built, and some well-trained teachers from abroad have been employed. Iran needs many more doctors and

it is to be hoped that the Medical Schools may be enlarged and improved year by year.

There is still much to be done in the line of preventive medicine, for so much of the disease of Iran is unnecessary. Malaria, tuberculosis, trachoma, venereal disease and puerperal septicemia are a few of the conditions which cry out for immediate control and eventual elimination. We are using 16 mm. movie films in many of the centers, showing subjects such as "Prevention of Pulmonary Tuberculosis," "Care of the Child," "Venereal Disease," etc., etc. Booklets have been prepared in Iranian on subjects such as "Trachoma," "Malaria," "Tuberculosis," "Prenatal Care" and others, and are distributed to those who can read and profit by instruction. There is still much to be done along these lines in this ancient land.

It is no exaggeration to say that in many centers in Iran medical missions have opened the field to the evangelist as well as to the educator. In fact, the three types of work have gone hand in hand, each contributing to the other, and all contributing to the logical presentation of a loving, divine Christ to the inquiring, stolid Moslem. Both the dispensary waiting room, and the hospital wards, as well as the homes of those ill, have proven fertile fields for gracious discussion of Christianity and the introduction of Jesus as a personal saviour.

As in any Moslem land, progress has been slow, but in various places in Iran today, where the Church of Christ has been established, you will find in those small, humble groups, men and women whose first contact with a Living Faith has been in a clinic built in the name of the Great Healer. In spite of new government hospitals and public dispensaries, there is still a great field in Iran for the medical missionary. Even in cities where there are free government hospitals, many come to the Christian Hospital (and pay for it, if they have money) because they have a confidence in the treatment that is given in the name of the Christ.

In this world of chaos and confusion all lands are af-

fected, and many are in immediate danger. Iran looks to America for leadership and guidance in a way that she has never done before. We can do much to help Iran, not only politically and financially but in demonstrating to her the Way of Life. Islam as a religion is rapidly losing its hold, especially among her educated leaders. They are drifting at present, influenced at times by Soviet propaganda (especially before the war) influenced often by Nazi propaganda, through radio and press and not knowing just which way to turn.

It is a definite challenge to the Christian church, that in these days of hatreds and destructive war, we present to Iran and to all the Moslem world a constructive program of Christian love and life, for the individual as well as for the nation.

New York City. H. A. LICHTWARDT.

AL-ASH'ARĪ AND HIS AL-IBĀNAH [1]

On page 24 of his Introduction Dr. Klein puts his finger, unawares apparently, upon the simple, sober explanation of Al-Ash'arī's life and work. For in his shrewd, if somewhat sharp, judgment of the Mu'tazilite movement, there lies implicit the answer to the riddle of the spiritual progress of the man, who was for so many years a zealous member of that movement, only to become in his latter days its most vigorous and successful opponent. The Mu'tazilites, observes Dr. Klein on page 24, in their desire to make religion reasonable, "took no account of the real nature of Islam, or indeed of religion in general. Religion is either irrational, or suprarational. It must vindicate its super-natural character, if it is to continue as religion and not suffer transformation into something else."

"Some of the Mu'tazilites and Qadarites," writes Al-Ash'arī (see translation, p. 46, bottom), "who turn away from the truth, have been led by their passions to follow their leaders and predecessors blindly and have interpreted the Koran in the light of their own opinions. But no authority for their interpretation has been revealed by God; nor has any proof of it been made known by Him; nor do they hand it down on the authority of the Apostle of the Lord of the Worlds or of the ancient Fathers."

It is clear that Al-Ash'arī recognized, or felt, the force of the sentiment which Dr. Klein has stated so succinctly, in so far, at least, as Islam is concerned. That some of the Mu'tazilites—not "many" of them, as Dr. Klein has it, nor Mehren's "un grand nombre"—, had in his judgment abandoned the Faith, not by denying revelation, but by

[1] A discussion and critique of Walter C. Klein's translation of *Al-Ash'arī's Al-Ibānah 'an usūl ad-diyānah* (American Oriental Series, vol. 19), American Oriental Society, New Haven, Connecticut, 1940. $2.00.

interpreting it, and had substituted therefore the personal predilections of some thinker or other, is also obvious. A few of them, like Ibn al-Rawandī, are said to have maintained the eternity of the world, denied a Creator and a Providence, and to have even attacked the prophets as wizards (see H. S. Nyberg's *Le Livre du Triomphe* of Al-Khayyāt, pp. 2-3; also H. Ritter in *Der Islam,* 1931, XIX, p. 12: Ibn al-Janzi's report on Ibn ar-Rawendi). But whether they accepted the principle and deliverances of revelation and apostolic authority, or not, all of them had employed, according to Al-Ash'arī, a false standard for religious truth (*cf.* Cureton's Shahrastānī on Al-Naẓẓām, pp. 37, 39, 55, 59).

"Reason," remarks Dr. Klein on page 24, "cannot dictate belief," an observation which Al-Ash'arī would have heartily approved. The Mu'tazilites, however, even those of them who admitted the direct revelation of the Koran, show by their arguments that Faith is for them, as for the extreme Murji'ites, knowledge, and knowledge finally the result of the dialectic, and that they consider revelation as a kind of knowledge, which should be substantiated by rational principles. The ultimate source of all truth, human or divine, was, in their eyes, Reason; and those of them who remained true to Koranic teaching, did so primarily, it may be conjectured, because of its appeal to reason and not because of the prophetic character of Muḥammad. Revelation, in the last analysis, is an offshoot of reason.

Against the primacy of reason Al-Ash'arī set his face inflexibly. The truths of religion can neither be won, nor established by reason, but only by revelation; and the only sources of doctrine are, therefore, the Koran and the Traditions, and, as a last resort, Ijmā', or general agreement, which seems, in this respect at least, to be regarded as an extension of the same principle as was at work in the Traditions. To demonstrate a doctrine means to cite proof-texts from divine revelation and to show that philologically they can only be taken in the sense desired

by the demonstrator. Traditions may then be quoted, either as additional evidence, or in order to expose the absurdity of an opponent's position. Al-Ash'arī, for example, refers to the Tradition concerning the joint of lamb, which addressed the Prophet, and disposes of the Jahmite doctrine of the Createdness of the Koran by pointing out that to accept that doctrine is to believe that it was God who says in this Tradition, "Eat me not, for I am poisoned" (*cf.* Klein, pp. 71-72).

To the evidence of texts and traditions the testimony of the dialectic may also be added. Al-Ash'arī thus supports the truth of the Blessed Vision in Paradise by the syllogism: "Nothing exists which God cannot show us; God exists; therefore He can show us Himself." But the dialectic is never a source of doctrine in itself. It can only serve to bear out a dogma already derived and verified from the Koran, or the Traditions, or to refute the views of an adversary, as when the doctrine of the Createdness of the Koran is demolished by showing that God's "Word" can be neither a body, nor the characteristic of a body, either of which it must be, if created (*cf.* Klein, pp. 61 and 75).

Dogmas for which there is no clear and specific Koranic evidence, as, for example, the Punishment of the Grave, the Pool, the Intercession of the Prophet and the Imamate of Abū Bakr and the other rightly guided Caliphs, are either deduced from Traditions, or based on Ijmā'. They may then be buttressed by Koranic texts interpreted in the light of the teaching of the Traditions, or the verdict of the Ijmā'. But there is no appeal to the dialectic in these cases for the Al-Ash'arī of the Ibānah at least (*cf.* Klein, pp. 130 ff.).

By his own unaided reason, man cannot achieve the truths of religion. Only by revelation can he come to know God and His will. Religion, if not irrational, is at least suprarational. And the significance of the *Ibānah* lies herein, that in it Al-Ash'arī exposed the fundamental fallacy of Mu'tazilite thought in regard to Islam's faith, and that thereby he turned it back once more to the original

source of its inspiration in the intuitions of its Prophet and the unsophisticated, concrete imagination of his early followers.

The authority of the Koran had never been seriously challenged, however diversely it may have been interpreted. Ḥasan al-Baṣrī's letter to the Umayyad Caliph, 'Abdalmalik, defends the doctrine of free-will by citing sacred texts, which demonstrate, to Ḥasan's mind at least, that most unpopular doctrine (see *Der Islam,* XXI 1933, June). But now the Traditions have also been canonized, and the interpretations of the Fathers and their simple, positive dogmas set up as a secondary rule of life and guide of thought.

So much, then, at least is true of the stories concerning Al-Ash'arī's visions of the Prophet. To Muḥammad he went for his enlightenment; and the Prophet's personal experience regarding God's nature and man's destiny settled for him once for all not only the principles of faith, but its whole content. Never have the intuitions of one man dominated a religion as Muḥammad's have Islam; and that domination is in a great measure the accomplishment of Al-Ash'arī. For he virtually fixed the subjects of Muslim religious thought by defining the sources of doctrine; and he determined the manner of the derivation of doctrine from these sources by example at least.

The substance of the Muslim faith has not grown much, if at all, since Al-Ash'arī's day. Its problems remain much the same as he confronted; and its answers are still his to a great extent. And Al-Ash'arī stamped on Islam a view of God and man that reflects the Prophet's closely. Islamic doctrine is still largely Koranic doctrine, which explains perhaps not only the narrow range of religious thought in Islam, but also its extreme subtlety and complexity. Absolute sovereignty, with its arbitrary power, is still God's essential characteristic, as it was for Muḥammad. The impotence of man's reason to explore the maze of divine purpose and choice is still acknowledged, as so often by the Prophet. And even yet the burden of Islamic

theology consists of the unity and power of God, the Last Judgment and Revelation (*cf.* Cureton's Shahrastānī, pp. 72, 73 and 74).

The cause of Al-Ash'arī's defection from the ranks of the Mu'tazilites was apparently a slowly matured consciousness of the fact that reason could not resolve the contradictions that arose from the assertion of separate religious truths, each one of which had not only the hallmark of revelation, but was in itself just as reasonable as any of the others. The problem of the relation of God's omnipotence to His foreknowledge seems especially to have troubled him, as the story of his argument with his master Al-Jubbā'ī indicates (see Klein, p. 27). Like his more famous successor, Al-Ghazālī, he was driven inevitably to the conclusion that religious truth lay beyond reason; but unlike Al-Ghazālī he did not find a private source of religious truth in mystical experience. Instead, he accepted the intuitions of a great religious leader and the ingenuous expositions of that leader's early followers as the only authoritative sources of divine knowledge, and by so doing he shackled Islam not only with a written and fixed revelation, but also with a written and fixed interpretation of that revelation. To reason went the minor part of recognizing the truths delivered and expounded in revelation and of substantiating them in its own realm.

Reason still had a part to play, however. Al-Ash'arī's quarrel with the Mu'tazilites was not because of their use of reason, but rather that, in their zeal to defend Islamic doctrine, they had come to put the cart before the horse and had rendered revelation subject to its handmaiden, reason. Al-Ash'arī does not accuse all Mu'tazilites, nor even the most of them, of interpreting the Koran subjectively, or of what is much the same thing, opposing the Traditions of the Companions of the Prophet (see Klein, p. 46, bottom and p. 47, top). But their reliance on the dialectic to defend the doctrines of Islam had led them, he believed, to overlook the real sources of these doctrines and to disregard the true relation of reason to revelation. And the

faith of Islam was in danger of becoming in their hands a philosophy inspired by a revelation instead of a revelation supported by a dialectic.

That al-Ash'arī's apprehensions concerning the trend of Mu'tazilite controversies were not baseless can be easily ascertained by the simple comparison of the various Mu'tazilite definitions of God's nature and their predominantly negative propositions with the positive, concrete declarations of Al-Ash'arī himself in regard to God. The former are philosophical by nature. The latter have the character of a religious creed. An examination of the questions which the Mu'tazilites raised and of their method of enquiry will also soon convince us that his fears were just and well-grounded. For although the subject-matter of their discussions is theological, in dealing with it they do not acknowledge any objective authority; and their method of enquiry is the Socratic method of division, or *diaeresis*.

Is God, for example, a thing, or not? Is He a thing in reality, or only by analogy with His creatures? And if He is really a thing, is He different from other things, or not? And if He is different, is the difference essential or accidental? (See H. Ritter's *Die dogmatischen Lehren der Anhänger des Islam von . . . Al-Ash'arī,* Bibliotheka Islamica; Ia. p. 181 ff.).

Are the divine names and attributes things, or not? Or is the Creator with His attributes a thing? Are they eternal, or created? Or is the Creator with His attributes eternal? Do they belong to His essence, or not? Are they He, or other than He, identical with Him, or distinct from Him; or are they neither He, nor other than He? Are they real, or only by analogy with those of His creatures? Are they actual judgments that God is knowing, powerful, hearing, seeing, etc., or just denials that the opposites of these characteristics apply to Him, or assertions of His being accompanied by knowledge of something known, decreed, heard, or seen, etc., or by denials of His ignorance, weakness, deafness, or blindness, etc.? Are they distinct

from one another or not? And if they are, does the distinction rest in a difference in God Himself, or in a difference between what is known, decreed, heard, or seen, etc., or between what is denied, or what is taught, concerning God? (*Ibid.,* pp. 171-172; 183; 169 and 172; 166-167 and 174).

Can it be said that God knows, or is that said of Him only by analogy? And if He actually knows, is His knowledge or knowing eternal, or created, as *Jahm* and his followers maintained? And if it is eternal, does He know through Himself, through a knowledge which is He, as Abū'l-Hudhail puts it; or is His knowledge an essential attribute which, in the words of 'Abdullah b. Kullāb, is neither He, nor other than He, or an eternal form, as Mu'ammar defined it? Or is knowing predicated of God simply to assert His being and to deny that He is ignorant, as Al-Naẓẓām believed; or is it just a name for God accompanied by knowledge of an object of knowledge, as 'Abbād, who denied God knowledge, declared? (*Ibid.,* pp. 184; 157, 222; 164-169; 173; 165-166).

And if God's knowledge is eternal, what is the object of His eternal knowledge? Does He know things other than Himself eternally? Are created things objects of God's knowledge before they come to be, or only after He has willed them, and they actually exist? Does He know universals, such as things, substances, accidents and acts eternally, but not particulars, such as bodies and things created, or done? Has His knowledge a limit, or not? Are His objects of knowledge infinite, or not? (*Ibid.,* pp. 158-159; 220; 163.)

Is God's will that which He wills, commands and creates, or is it something subsistent in Himself? Is it an attribute of action, or are there two kinds of divine will, one an essential attribute, and the other one of action; and has the essential will no relation at all to the sins of the creatures? Does God's willing of the coming-to-be of things mean His causing them to exist, and does His willing of the acts of His creatures, on the other hand, mean

only His commanding of them? (*Ibid.*, pp. 189-190; cf. also Cureton's Shahrastānī, pp. 35, 38, 45, 53).

Have God's decrees and acts a limit, or not? Has God power over that over which He has granted His creatures power, or not? And if He can do that which by a delegation of power His creatures can do, is there any distinction between what God does and man does in this sphere? Is an act, of which both God and man are capable, necessary, when produced by God, but "acquired," when man does it, as Al-Shaḥḥām asserted? Does God will the sins of His creatures eternally, or not? Does He do so in the sense that He abandons them to their sins, as Abū Mūsā al-Mirdād supposed? Can God do wrong and injustice, or not? And if He can, does He? Can He do that which He knows will not be? Can He bring into existence that which He knows will not come to be? (*Ibid.*, pp. 164, 190, 199-203.)

The remaining attributes, and other theological problems as well, are treated in similar fashion; and each alternative is upheld by some doctor or other. The prevailing drift of Mu'tazilite thought may have sought to establish the unity of God's nature by identifying the essential attributes of knowledge, power and life with God Himself and possibly by maintaining the createdness of the Koran and of God's will. It may have endeavored to confirm God's justice by repudiating Predestination and defending man's free-will and to dispose of the anthropomorphic characteristics by investing them with a spiritual meaning and taking Seeing and Hearing, for example, when used of God, in the sense of knowing, and Eyes and Hands in the sense of knowledge and power, or grace. And it may have attempted to get rid of superstition by denying such dogmas as the Punishment of the Grave, the Pool, the intercession of the Prophet, and God's descent each night to the Lower Heavens.

But the broad stream of the Mu'tazilite movement bore, as we have seen, many varied currents of opinion in its bosom, every one of which should be studied in relation

to Ash'arite theology. For this movement never produced a synthetic scheme of thought, nor even an eclectic system. Its raison d'être was not, in fact, the creation of a unified body of belief, but rather the interpretation of certain inherited doctrines in favour of a particular view of divine nature and human destiny, to which end the Mu'tazilites made use of a heterogeneous lot of ideas borrowed for the most part from the various schools of Greek thought which they had come to know.

The final triumph of the Ash'arites, indeed, is in no small part due to the fact that they at last achieved the ultimate objective of the Mu'tazilite movement, which the Mu'tazilites themselves failed to do, because they did not examine narrowly enough the grounds of their teaching; and Ash'arite theology may be truly said to be the definitive form of Mu'tazilite thought. For it did not merely recognize in revelation the actual source of religious truth. It also succeeded in devising an epistemological, as well as a cosmological, scheme compatible with that truth and in reconciling revelation with reason to this extent at least, which was probably all that the Mu'tazilites had hoped to accomplish. And the Ash'arites have, in fact, been called Hāshimites and the attributes of Al-Ash'arī identified with the "states" of Abū Hāshim (See Cureton's Shahrastānī, pp. 55-56, 59 and 67).

And Al-Ash'arī himself informs us that the Mu'tazilites were unanimous in declaring that God is eternally knowing, powerful and living, and that they denied, for example, that He knows through a created knowledge, as Jahm and his school claimed. The majority of them, it is true, seem to have maintained that God is knowing, powerful and living through Himself, and not through a knowledge, etc. But some of them, such as 'Abdullah b. Kullāb and his followers, did not in fact dispute the divine attributes. On the contrary, they affirmed them and asserted that they belonged to God's essence, explaining their relation to the essence, like the later Ash'arites, by saying that they were neither God nor other than God, neither identical with

Him, nor distinct from Him. Some of Ibn Kullāb's disciples, we are told, even acknowledged God's "Face" as an attribute, although they refused to say of it that it was neither God nor other than God. The Baṣrian Mu'tazilites also upheld the thesis of a distinction between the attributes; and most Mu'tazilites accepted apparently the doctrine of the infinity of God's knowledge, decrees and acts (Ritter, I a., pp. 157 bottom; 206, 11; 164; 169ff.; 171.7; 176 bottom; 163).

In general also they seem to have endorsed the popular opinion that God is a thing unlike the [created] things. For the only controversy that arose among them respecting this dogma appears to have been in regard to the definition of the difference existing between God and the things, whether it is essential or not. Some of them held that the statement, "God is a thing," implies that He is essentially unlike the things. But others were of the opinion that the Creator is unlike the things, not essentially, but because of a difference which is an attribute and neither God nor other than God (*Ibid.*, p. 181).

A saying of Al-Ṣāliḥī sheds perhaps further light on this dogma by relating it to another Mu'tazilite controversy. "My declaration that God is a knower unlike the knowers," he says, "or a willer unlike the willers, etc., means that He is a thing unlike the things." Al-Ash'arī reports this statement of Al-Ṣāliḥī in the course of his discussion of Mu'tazilite views concerning the attributes, from which it is clear that Al-Ṣāliḥī belonged to the exponents of the thesis that God is knowing, powerful and living through Himself and not through a knowledge etc. (*Ibid.*, p. 168).

His reason for stating his faith in this form is not so obvious; but it may be conjectured that he devised this formula in order to avoid being identified with those who held that these qualities are predicated of God by analogy, and not in reality. Ibn al-Iyādī, for example, asserted that man is knowing, hearing, seeing, etc. in reality, and that God is said to be so only by analogy; and just the opposite

position was taken by Al-Nāshī. But most of the Mu'tazilites seem to have affirmed the attributes as proper ideas concerning God and also, presumably, concerning man, notwithstanding the fact that God is a thing unlike the things (*Ibid.*, pp. 183 and 184).

How these proper ideas are acquired in respect of God is unfortunately nowhere the subject of debate in our sources. But in these circumstances it is possible to suppose that some Mu'tazilites at least may have assumed a position similar to that summed up in the Ash'arite phrase, *bilā kayfa* ("without further enquiry"), which is a very convenient phrase, as Dr. Klein remarks (note 93), but not essentially meaningless. For axioms and definitions, as well as intuitions and revelation, are accepted *bilā kayfa;* and the words have a very positive meaning, when the theological arguments which produced them are studied and analyzed.

There was controversy among the Mu'tazilites, it should also be observed, concerning even the fundamental ethical assumptions; and some of them reached conclusions respecting morals that foreshadow those of the later Ash'arites. For although the most of them denied God the power to do that which He has granted His creatures the power to do, Al-Shaḥḥām, on the contrary, declared that God has this power; and a movement, of which both God and man is capable, is said by him to be necessary, when produced by God, but "acquired," when man does it. Others, including Al-Jubbā'ī, believed that God can perform acts of the same genus as those which He has enabled His creatures to perform. And very significant in this regard also is the fact, recorded by Al-Ash'arī, that some Mu'tazilites maintained that the ability to produce an act (*istiṭā'ah*) does not endure for two moments of time, that its continuance is impossible, that an act is produced by an antecedent power which has ceased thereby to exist, that the coming-to-be of the act, is however, incompatible with inability, and that God creates in the second moment a power so that the act takes place (*Ibid.*, pp. 199-200, 230).

Some Mu'tazilites also conceded that God has dominion over wrong and injustice. Some of them indeed went so far as to assert that God can Himself do evil. And according to Abū'l-Hudhail, Abū Mūsā al-Mirdād advanced the thesis, since adopted by the Ash'arites, that God wills the sins of His servants in the sense that He abandons them to their sins, which is what Muḥammad really meant, according to Goldziher, when he said that God "caused them to err" (*Ibid.,* pp. 200 and 190, line 8).

With such intimations of Ash'arite theology scattered throughout Mu'tazilite controversy, it is little wonder that in the East the Ash'arites were still confused with the so-called proponents of unity and justice until well into the fifth century of the Hijrah, when, along with the Mu'tazilites and other sects, they were anathematized from the pulpit and persecuted under the Seljuk, Tughril-beg, who died in 1063 A.D. Under Tughril-beg's son, Alp Arslan, and his famous vizier, Niẓām al-Mulk, they won to power, it is true, in Persia, as they had formerly in Irāq under the Būyids; and thence their authority spread West to Syria and Egypt under the Ayyubites and Mameluks and finally to North Africa in the twelfth century under the Almohads. But for the old-fashioned, intransigeant orthodox the Ash'arites remained heretics; and neither the Ḥanbalites of the East, nor the Ẓāhirites of the West accepted their doctrines. That doughty Spanish dogmatist, Ibn Ḥazm (d. 1063 A.D.), sped his fiercest invective against them and not against the Mu'tazilites, nor even the Anthropomorphists; and he accused Al-Ash'arī of having introduced the false doctrine of the Attributes into Islam and of contradicting even God Himself in his conception of the Divine Word. And some four centuries later another Ẓāhirite, Al-Maqrīzī (d. 1405 A.D.), summed up his case against the Ash'arites by saying that their system had prevailed by blood and violence (see A. F. Mehren's *Exposé de la Réforme de l'Islamisme,* pp. 56-57 and I. Goldziher's *Die Ẓāhiriten,* pp. 137-139, 151, 191-200).

Dr. Klein introduces his translation of the *Ibānah* with a very competent, if necessarily brief, review of the history of theological controversy in Islam up to and even beyond the days of Al-Ash'arī. Exception might be taken to some of his statements, since he writes, for example, on page 11 that "the Murji'ites did not go the length of withholding obedience from the rulers and calling them heretics," when, in fact, they occasionally did (*cf.* Ṭabari, ii, pp. 1349 ff. and 1595), and also declares on page 15 that the origin of the Mu'tazilites "was an independent one," despite the fact that the traditional story told of that origin connects it with the Khārijite-Murji'ite debate over the problem of mortal sins, (see Dr. Klein, p. 15, and Cureton's Shahrastānī, p. 33). But more important perhaps and far more pertinent is the question of the appropriateness of the Introduction, and whether it might not have been more desirable to have studied the more immediate relations of Al-Ash'arī's thought in the *Ibānah* with a view to placing his achievement in its distinctive setting and allowing its significance to appear in its proper light.

For that thought takes little account of controversies which have either been settled by the march of events, or stilled for the time being at least. The Khārijite-Murji'ite dispute concerning Faith and Works has apparently been compounded by means of an impoverishing, if perhaps justifiable, synthesis. Faith is not the whole of Islam, as some extremists of the Murji'ites would have it. It consists of words and deeds and is subject to increase and decrease (see Dr. Klein, pp. 52-53). But rebellion also is unlawful. To "go out," like the Khārijites, against the duly elected Caliph is a sin, even if he has forsaken justice and righteousness; and no one, who prays facing Mecca, is to be considered an infidel in virtue of the commission of a mortal sin, unless he assert its legality (*Ibid.*, pp. 52 and 54). And the Shī'ite conception of the person and place of the Imām is ignored, notwithstanding that Al-Ash'arī has devoted the last chapter of his *Ibānah* to a repudiation of the non-recognition of the first three

Caliphs by most Shī'ites and of their condemnation even of 'Alī's conduct.

What we call Shī'ism, or Imāmism, was evidently not a live issue for the Al-Ash'arī of the *Ibānah.* Nor was Khārijite, or Murji'ite teachings, save when these sects had adopted as their own Mu'tazilite ideas, or had clung tenaciously, as was the case with the Jahmites, to the most extreme views of the sect and developed still further the doctrinal implications of these views. It is difficult, indeed, to judge from the *Ibānah,* which foe Al-Ash'arī feared the more, the Mu'tazilites, or the Jahmites. Page after page of the treatise is given over to the refutation of Jahmite tenets, such as the Createdness of the Koran and of God's knowledge (see Klein, pp. 68 ff. and 100 ff.), or to the discussion of their denial of His "face," hearing and seeing (*Ibid.,* p. 88 ff.); which is not only a most interesting and suggestive historical fact, but also a very perplexing one. For the Jahmites were a Murji'ite sect with a faith, through which ran a rich vein of Christian thought.

Jahm himself was slain in Merv in the last days of the Umayyads, when the Murji'ites of Khurāsān were in revolt against the Lords of Damascus under the Tamīmite, Ḥārith ibn Suraij, to whom Jahm was secretary (*cf.* Ṭabarī, ii, pp. 1918 ff., 1924, 1575). Such details of his teaching as have come down to us reveal a thorough-going Murji'ite bent of mind, for which Faith is knowledge of God only and unbelief ignorance of Him, and which found some elements of Christian doctrine very attractive and easy to assimilate. Al-Ash'arī states in his *Ibānah* that Jahm, like the Mu'tazilites, taught the Christian notion that "hearing" and "seeing" are predicated of God only in the sense of "knowing" (see Dr. Klein, pp. 88 and 99); and in his *Maqālāt* he informs us that Jahm also believed in the finitude of God's knowledge, decrees and acts, and held that Paradise and Hell would pass away and their peoples perish, so that finally there would be nothing besides God, as it was in the beginning, beliefs that smack of Origenistic Christianity (see Ritter, Ia., pp. 164, 174, 279, and H. S.

Nyberg's ed. of *Le Livre du Triomphe,* p. 12).

Jahm affirmed the Createdness of the Koran, of course, as well as of God's Knowledge, but rejected the notion of God's being a thing, since that would imply a comparison of Him with created things. He also asserted, curiously enough, that only God creates, and that man's acts are assigned to him only by analogy. His followers, however, we are told, denied absolute predestination and conceived of faith and infidelity in true Murji'ite fashion as indivisible qualities of the heart, namely, knowledge and ignorance of God (Ritter, Ia., pp. 41, 132, 136, 141, 181, 222 and 279; *Le Livre du Triomphe,* p. 126).

That Al-Ash'arī felt this Murji'ite confession with its Christian affiliations to be as great a peril to the conception of Islam, which he cherished and defended, as the general Mu'tazilite movement, is quite possible. For that confession was based on a fundamental principle, which, once it was clearly grasped and acknowledged, would inevitably destroy the grounds of his own belief, since faith, that is a quality of the heart, is ultimately independent of a prophetic revelation and authority. And the Jahmites were not the only Murji'ites, who were inspired and encouraged by the Mu'tazilite movement. The followers of Al-Najjār, Abū Shamr and Ibn Shabīb also drew spiritual strength from it and strove to advance their cause under its wing; and individual Mu'tazilites, such as Abū'l-Ḥusain al-Ṣāliḥī, openly professed their Murji'ite propensities. Al-Ash'arī, in fact, lists him as a Murji'ite as well as a Mu'tazilite. (Ritter, Ia, pp. 135-136, 182, 216-218, 283-284; 134-135, 152; 137-138, 201; 132-133, 158, 168, 197, 231-233).

Dr. Klein's judgment (p. 25) that Al-Ash'arī's "title to renown is based mainly . . . upon his discovery of a middle, intellectual ground for orthodoxy, etc.," is, as he himself declares (pp. 25 and 30), the traditional estimate of the man and his work. It has been generally accepted, since Al-Juwainī pronounced it in the eleventh century; and Mehren, in fact, just reproduces it in his *Exposé de la*

Réforme de l'Islamisme (See pp. 39 and 70. *Cf.* Ibn Khaldūn III, 27-43). But Dr. Klein rejects this view on page 30 and suggests that Al-Ash'arī was "simply a disciple of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, without the latter's prejudice against "the Kalām," a statement that deserves clarification. For Aḥmad's prejudice against the Kalām might be considered an essential element of that discipleship and has indeed been so regarded by strict Ḥanbalites. And Al-Ash'arī's doctrine of the attributes might have been anathema to his self-imposed master, as it has been to the rigid partisans of that master and to the Ẓāhirites.

On page 9 of his treatise, *Die Mu'taziliten,* Steiner declares with Shahrastānī (See Cureton's ed., p. 20, 1. 5) that Al-Ash'arī moulded the orthodox doctrine into the exact form of a scholastic system, which is perhaps what Dr. Klein had in mind, although probably he would not be so positive about "the exact form of a scholastic system." For Steiner manifestly exaggerates the creative genius of Al-Ash'arī, in so far, at least, as it is reflected in the *Ibānah.* Nevertheless it is clear that Al-Ash'arī determined and defined once for all the sources of Muslim doctrine, and also laid down by example at any rate the main lines of defence for the dogmas and laws derived from the Koran and Traditions, whereby, as Steiner has well said (p. 89), "The positive content of Islam has been restricted to some general doctrines and the religious and legal prescriptions necessary for the life of Church and State," a circumstance not altogether to be deplored.

Dr. Klein's translation of the *Ibānah* is also competent, even if occasionally he has failed to reproduce some turn of style or expression and to grasp, or at least render adequately, the somewhat involved dialectic of Al-Ash'arī.

That much used phrase, *Mā ankartum,* for example, is evidently the equivalent of *Limā ankartum,* "Why do you, then, deny?", as a study of its several occurrences might have shown; and Dr. Klein has so translated it on page 93, line 18. At least the Hyderabad text reads there (p. 53.6) *Mā ankartum,* and not *Limā ankartum* as on page 21, line

15 (translation, p. 64. 11) and page 52, line 5 (translation, p. 92.19). His failure to recognize this usage has led Dr. Klein to employ various renderings for this phrase, such as "You have not denied," "You do not deny," and "You cannot deny" (pp. 64, 72, 74, 93, 95, 97, 100, 103 ff.), not only to the confusion of a careful reader, but sometimes also to the enfeeblement of the argument and once, at least, to its stultification (See p. 72, top). The giving of the phrase by "You cannot deny," which rendering Dr. Klein adopts on page 97 and adheres to thereafter, is, however, quite satisfactory; and this translation might have been used in every case.

The phrase *Hallā ankartum,* means also "Why have you not denied?", and not "Do you not deny?" (p. 97.4), and *Hallā za'amtum* "Why do you not suppose?" and not "Do you not think?" (p. 99.4 from bottom). And *Ḥikmah* surely signifies "Wisdom" and neither "Word," nor "Art of Government" (pp. 43.21; 95.5 from bottom), and *Aujabū 'alainā,* "They oblige us to," and not "They think that, according to us." (p. 69.3 from bottom), and *Ẓāhir,* "Literal" and not "Actual" (p. 67.19); *Siwā',* "Alike" and not "Evil" (p. 71.7 from bottom); and *Mubīḥ* and *Ḥāṭir,* "One who permits and forbids," and not "A revealer, or an inaccessible one" (p. 105.4).

The Arabic verb-tenses have also been overlooked occasionally with consequent impairment of Al-Ash'arī's logic. Page 70, line 23 ff. should read: "Undoubtedly He (God) bore this testimony and heard it from Himself. For if He had heard it from a created thing, it would have been no testimony of His. But since it was His testimony, and He testified with it, He must have testified with it either before the coming-to-be of created things, or after their coming-to-be. If He testified with it after the coming-to-be of created things, His testimony to Himself does not complement the There is no God but He of the Creation. And how can that be, when it requires the non-existence of testimony to the unity! (i.e., up to the time of the Creation). Therefore He testified with it as a witness

before the Creation, etc." (*Cf.* also p. 106, line 9 from the bottom).

But some passages of the translation are obscure, not for the reasons already advanced, but because their meaning has not been clearly grasped, or perhaps expressed, or because some necessary and almost self-evident reconstruction of the text has not been undertaken. Page 135, line 22 ff. should run: "The Imāmate of 'Alī after 'Uthmān is confirmed by the pact made with him by the controlling Companions, and because no other member of the Council received such a pact in his time, and by reason of the fact that his excellence and justice were unanimously admitted. His shunning of the claim of sovereignty during the days of the previous Caliphs was proper, because of his knowledge that that was not the time of his election. And when it became his after the Caliphs before him, that too was proper because of his knowledge that this was the time of his election."

Page 100, line 21 ff. should have been reconstructed. Dr. Klein himself observes (note 396) that the Hyderabad edition has a note at this point. That note calls attention to the fact that there is a lacuna in the text; and what is missing is quite obvious, once the pattern of the argument has been identified.

"If they say," declares Al-Ash'arī, "that God's knowledge cannot be originated, because then it must have originated in another knowledge and so on ad infinitum, it may be replied: 'Why do you deny, then, that God's will is unoriginated and uncreated, because, in that case, it must have originated in another will and so on ad infinitum!' And if they say that God's knowledge cannot be originated, [because then He must be a knower through a knowledge, which He has created in another than Himself, it may be replied that God's will also cannot be originated] because, in that case, He must be a willer through a will, which He has created in another than Himself, etc."

And page 64, line 9 from the bottom ff. should run as

follows: "If the heart's knowledge of God and its discernment [and] vision of Him (reading a *waw* before *ru'yatuhu*) are not comprehension, or attainment, why do you deny that the eyes' vision and discernment of God are not comprehension and attainment!" The emendation is supported by the logic of the previous argument.

Other passages might also be cited to show that a closer study of the discussion, even in its English version, would have disclosed imperfections that might have been ironed out before publication, to the enhancement of the no mean accomplishment of Dr. Klein's work. For Al-Ash'arī's dialectic is at times devious and introduces evidence and applies arguments, which are strange and unfamiliar to us; and occasionally his meaning can only be grasped and the text established by a strict adherence to the rules of logic and grammar.

The "Index of Personal and Group Names occurring in the Introduction" should surely have been extended to include such names also, when they appear in the translation, which is, after all, the body of the book. And in the "Index of Arabic Words" care should have been taken to cite the particular passage, or passages, where the English equivalent of a word, or an explanation of it, would be found. We are referred, for example, to page 29 in the case of the term, *Istiṭā'ah,* and find neither a rendering of it, nor any discussion regarding it. Our attention should have been directed instead to page 108 and note 424. Page 128, note 536, is the proper reference for *'alā*. But why was this preposition included in an index of technical terms? The word, *Ṭafrah,* is neither translated, nor interpreted, on page 29. There is usually one passage in a book which is especially significant for the meaning of any given word; and that passage alone should be cited in the index, or else it should be distinguished in some way from the other references. There are also some important omissions in Dr. Klein's bibliography.

Harvard University. WILLIAM THOMSON.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Christian Approach to the Moslem. By James Thayer Addison. Columbia University Press, 1942. pp. 365 + x. $3.75.

There is no occasion for dismay or despair as the Church faces the Moslem world. Many friends of missions have acted as though there were. They have often had a feeling of frustration. In the course of its history the Crescent has won far more ground from the Cross than the Cross has regained from the Crescent. Most of such recovery as has been registered by the Christian forces has been as the aftermath of political conquest and often by methods which the conscientious Christian cannot approve. Once a land has submitted to Moslem rulers and Moslem law has become operative, conversions from Islam by the road of persuasion and love have been all but impossible. Until recent decades, death has been the usual lot of those subjects of Moslem princes who have abandoned the Prophet for the Christ. Even now in lands such as Turkey and Egypt any extensive movement toward the Church would meet opposition both from the state and the populace. When, in the face of the great Christian missionary movement of the past century and a half, the Crescent and the Cross have competed for the allegiance of animists, the former has often advanced more rapidly than the latter. No well informed observer can honestly gainsay these sobering facts. Yet the Christian need not admit defeat. A comprehensive survey of the record of Protestant missions to Moslems in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries shows encouraging, even though numerically slight gains. In the past twenty-five years these gains have been gathering momentum.

This is the impression made by a reading of Dr. James Thayer Addison's latest book, *The Christian Approach to the Moslem.* Dr. Addison has long commanded the respect of students of Christian missions by his sound scholarship, his gracious charm, and his clear Christian faith. As Professor of the History of Religion and Missions in the Cambridge Episcopal Theological School he stimulated in his students a warm interest in missions and was the author of a number of books which combined readability and accuracy. Latterly, as Administrative Vice President of the National Council of the Episcopal Church, he has brought to the missionary enterprise of his Church the knowledge of the expert, and executive gifts. His latest book was written while he still held his professorial chair. It is the result of extensive reading and of travel, and combines the felicity of style, the learning, and the wisdom which we have learned to expect from the author.

The first section of the book, which includes seven chapters

and about a fourth of the pages, is a rapid, comprehensive survey of the pre-nineteenth century relations of Christianity and Islam. It has to do chiefly with Roman Catholic efforts to win the Moslems. It narrates in excellent fashion the story which, well known to the experts, is all too little familiar to the average missionary and pastor. The remainder of the volume, about three-fourths of the whole, covers country by country, Protestant missions to Moslems. The summary is geographically comprehensive, although some countries are placed in appendices rather than in the main body of the work. In connection with each land there is given something of the political, social, and religious setting in the midst of which missions have operated. After the first section, almost nothing is said of Roman Catholic activity. This is unfortunate, for that great branch of the Church has been as zealous in its efforts to win Moslems as have Protestants. Moreover, not all of the Protestant agencies are catalogued. To have done so would have increased the usefulness of the book as a work of reference but would have greatly extended its length and perhaps have detracted from its readability. The essential features of Protestant missions have been made to stand out with a clarity which might have been obscured had more detail been given. No attempt is made at elaborate documentation, but footnote references are given to some of the more pertinent sources of information. In the concluding chapters generalizations are ventured on the methods employed for the care of the convert and on some of the main features of missions to Moslems. Dr. Addison has been careful to bring the story down to date. His interest is not so much in the history for its own sake as in making the history contribute to the continuing and growing efforts to bring the Gospel to the Moslems. Dr. Addison is objective, as true scholarship requires, but he leaves no shadow of doubt as to his own Christian convictions.

The total impression which the book makes upon at least one reader, as the opening sentence of this review indicates, is one of hope. When the entire Moslem field is surveyed, it is clear that a considerable amount of effort has been expended by Protestants in their endeavor to reach the Moslems. On the whole, this effort has been growing. Lessons in methods of approach have been learned. Improved training for missionaries has been devised and applied. Advance has been registered in the preparation, printing, and distribution of literature. Moreover, in the past quarter of a century increasing numbers of Moslems have been won to Christ and have affiliated themselves with the Church. The movement has been particularly marked in Iran, India, and the Netherlands Indies. It would be distorting the facts to claim that any mass movement is in progress. Conversions are as yet a mere trickle. But here and there the trickle is becoming a rivulet, even though still a small one. Protestants have not yet directed nearly as much attention to the Moslem world as to some of the other non-Christian sections of the globe. Yet advance can be recorded. It is to be hoped that this book will contribute to the advance. That clearly is the wish of the author. He has not written for the expert (although the expert will find little if anything to criticize) but for the

thoughtful Christian and the rank and file of those who are committed to missions. He deserves a wide circle of readers.

Yale University. KENNETH S. LATOURETTE.

Man's Quest for Salvation: an historical and comparative Study of the Idea of Salvation in the World's Great Living Religions. By Charles Samuel Braden. Chicago and New York. Willett Clark and Co. 1941. 8vo. pp. xii, 274. $2.50.

Starting from the fact that in every religion known to us, one element, perhaps the most important element, is the attempt of man through religion to achieve some enduring satisfaction, Dr. Braden suggests that "seeking salvation" is the most adequate term to describe these attempts, and then proceeds to analyze the different conceptions found in the major living religions as to what precisely is that enduring satisfaction to be achieved, and what techniques are to be employed in seeking it.

It is an interesting and brightly written book. The author discusses salvation concepts and techniques in Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Sikhism, Chinese religions, Shintoism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, in that order, preferring where possible to let the Scriptures of these faiths speak for themselves, or in default the exposition of native expositors of those faiths. This, of course, has two serious drawbacks. Not commanding the original tongues of the Scriptures themselves, the author is at the mercy of translations, and of Western-educated native expositors of these faiths, whose expositions are frequently suspect of being highly doctored for Western consumption, a fact which is notoriously true of one of his main authorities for Hinduism. For the most part, however, where this reviewer is sufficiently familiar with the original sources to form an opinion, he has chosen his illustrative material wisely. There may be some criticism that his longest chapter, that on Christianity, is somewhat overstuffed with material on modern social interpretations of Christianity, which seem only remotely relevant to his main thesis.

Readers of the MOSLEM WORLD will naturally be mostly interested in the chapter on Islam, where the author is somewhat put to it to discover, amidst the welter of contradictory conceptions both in the Qur'an and in the later popular theology, exactly what is the "enduring satisfaction" that Islam seeks to achieve. He defines it as an other-worldly type of salvation-quest, where escape from hell and eternal bliss in paradise are the final goal, and the techniques, at least of orthodox Islam, are a combination of faith and works, though the element of grace, the eternal election by Allah, is an element that complicates the picture. The Index is good, but the Bibliography distressingly inadequate.

ARTHUR JEFFERY.

That They May Have Life. The Story of the American University of Beirut, 1866-1941. By Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr. Published by the Trustees of the American University of Beirut, New York, 1941. pp. xviii, 348. $3.75.

We have here the story of the American University of Beirut on the occasion of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the University.

The author writes, as he says, "from the standpoint of an American observer," but, be it known, that observer is highly qualified by experience and profession to write this book. Dr. Penrose spent three years (1928-1931) as a tutor at the University and after some years as a college teacher in the United States, accepted his present position as Assistant Director of the Near East College Association.

This volume is a piece of fine workmanship, both by printer and by author. One has been led to expect beautifully produced books from the Princeton University Press and this one is no exception. I notice only one typographical error. I have likewise noticed only one awkwardly constructed sentence. More than this, one is delighted by the skill of the author as evidenced not only by the mastery of his material and his strict "attention to business" when he must have had many temptations to explore by-paths, but by many finely chiseled phrases, for instance, when speaking of the administration of the University in war time he says that it is "experienced in the wisdom of reticence."

The author, quite naturally, divides the volume into three major sections according to the work of the three presidents, Daniel Bliss, 1866-1902, Howard Sweetser Bliss, 1902-1920, and Bayard Dodge, 1922 to the present. Considering the remarkable 36 years of the first president, it seems somewhat strange that the section dealing with his work should be the briefest, but the fact that world wars have interrupted the University during the work of the second and third presidents is probably sufficient reason.

One who knows the Near East and something of the religious and educational work of Americans in that area cannot but find many interesting passages in this story. There is a great deal in it for a Christian missionary to Moslems to ponder. There is a great deal in it to justify, to illuminate and to illustrate the missionary enterprise. What makes a college or a university Christian? How should an institution, founded by missionaries and professing all through its history to be Christian and missionary, deal with non-Christians, especially Moslem students? The reader will soon recognize that the founders and leaders of the Syrian Protestant College which became in 1920 the American University of Beirut were men of "liberal tendencies." The words of President Bliss in 1872 are said to be a spiritual cornerstone: "This College is for all conditions and classes of men without regard to color, nationality, race or religion. A man white, black, or yellow; Christian, Jew, Mohammedan or heathen, may enter and enjoy all the advantages of this institution for three, four, or eight years; and go out believing in one God, in many gods, or in no God. But it will be impossible for anyone to continue with us long without knowing what we believe to be the truth and our reasons for that belief."

Boston, Mass. FRED FIELD GOODSELL.

Biography of the Gods. By A. Eustace Haydon. New York, Macmillan Co., 1941. pp. 352. $2.50.

This book appears to be sculpture in cold stone. Its abundant excellent, erudite phrases are patiently chiseled ornamentation of a body which shows little soul—enthusiasm is lacking. Perhaps

the whole is, in the author's own phrase, something of a "revolt from God." Certainly there is little in the entire volume—p. 252 provides some of this little—which would not be shocking to an earnest, faithful Christian. Indeed, devoted non-Christians, including Moslems, in particular, would be disturbed (although this observation is somewhat beside the point of the production!).

The book has a thesis of its own. Perhaps, after all, the initial words of the Preface indicate it adequately—"The gods . . . like man . . . are earthborn." The treatise adheres closely throughout to this initial assumption—and concludes as an obituary! The gods, too, perish. But hold! There is in the same preface this sentence, " . . . faith in God is the daring confidence of man that the universe in its deepest meaning does allow and give support to our human hopes and ideals." And yet (*cf.* p. 324) we are told that "all we have ever had, all we can ever have are ideas of God." This is, of course, not to say that God is merely *idea.* Nevertheless, the book nowhere indicates the *fact* of God and faith in his reality. Some readers might suppose that the author may have taken his cue from a major phase of Hindu thought, when in his opening sentence he announces that "the gods are on this side of the mystery that enshrouds the universe." Many Hindu thinkers have posited the Absolute beyond all the gods.

This is a "biography." The very word intrigues us. This reviewer has within reach as he writes a 1283-page biography of a single man (J. A. Garfield). Curiosity prompted him to count the number of gods mentioned in Professor Haydon's work of 350 pages and he was soon beyond a hundred deities. In other words, these many sketches illustrate the thesis which they serve. They are not biographical to any competent degree. By the same token this reviewer is scarcely competent to judge the exact quality of all the book's details and the cogency of every observation. Readers as well as the author himself indulge impressions of an illimitable expanse of even human history and experience. It is almost inevitable that such a work is liable to minor criticisms. There are many instances of inaccurate transliteration and some inaccuracies of statement, not to mention occasional rationalization (?) of simple data. But a major criticism might be directed at the baffling suggestion—if not the explicit assertion—that all the gods have come and gone as men come and go and that they act, even deliberately, as men act, that the gods may even be the creation of men! "Like the other great gods of the world, Allah" was created and clothed by faith (*cf.* p. 296), even while he was "recognized as a god of absolute will,"—personified fate.

The whole study may seem to be but an "historical" account, having no philosophy of things. Yet there is a philosophy—the very thesis of the work. God is virtually dismissed by way of the "gods." This is not unlike a dismissal of Life by way of the many lives—no *Bios* to write about, but only *bioi.* And the work concludes in The Twilight of the Gods. The author cannot know for sure (*cf.* p. 327) and therefore he reserves his faith. "The gods live by faith." Belief may have been "good for the masses," but "what the gods

have been expected to do, and have failed to do through the ages, man must find the courage and intelligence to do for himself." This is almost the last observation in the volume. But a little earlier (p. 313) the author concluded his chapter on Allah with a conclusion which fits the work as a whole, namely, "When man at last assumes responsibility for the creation of the values, he desires and finds the plastic stuff of reality yielding readily to his molding intelligence and will, some day he will look up from his work, surprised to find that God has taken the opportunity to disappear." In such statements the author declares an exclusive humanism and an utter indifference to any persistent, unselfish dependence on the part of man himself—any man, Christian, Moslem, Jew, or other.

Yale University,
New Haven, Conn. JOHN CLARK ARCHER.

Gateway to Tibet: The Kansu Tibetan Border. By Robert B. Ekvall, B.A., F.R.G.S. Introduction by Rev. William Christie. Christian Publications, Inc., Harrisburg, Pa. pp. 198. $1.00 per copy; five or more copies at 75¢ each.

No one could be better qualified than the son of the early pioneer of the Christian Missionary Alliance to tell the story of forty-one years of sacrificial service on the border-marches of Tibet. The region described (as I realized during my first visit in 1933) is famous for its marvelous scenery and its heterogeneous population of Chinese, Tibetans, Mongols, Salars and aborigines. Many races and religions met on this roof-of-Asia and they were often in deadly conflict. During the period of this narrative there were two Moslem rebellions, the Boxer uprising, the White Wolf raids and the Red invasion of Kansu. On four occasions the entire missionary staff had to be evacuated.

The author, an intrepid missionary, tells the story of the beginnings, in 1895, of expansion and fruitage, of dangers and readjustment after the crises had passed. The remainder of the book (pp. 91-190) tells of the threefold task that now faces the mission, namely work among Chinese, among Moslems, and the penetration into Lamaistic Tibet. Islam in Kansu goes back to the earliest Moslem invasions and has rooted itself deep in the life and culture of the people. The million and a half followers of the Prophet are conscious as are the missionaries of the solidarity of Islam. Islam in Kansu is a racial as well as a religious problem. Hochow has been called the Mecca of Chinese Moslems. The story is of deep interest. God's providence used Islam to further His Kingdom. The volume has a good map, nearly a score of excellent illustrations, but lacks an index.

S. M. ZWEMER.

In This Generation: The Story of Robert P. Wilder. By Ruth Wilder Braisted. Friendship Press, New York. pp. 205. $1.25.

The title of this biography is a phrase taken from the Watchword of the Student Volunteer Movement. It is symbolic of Robert Wilder's deepest conviction, inspiration and message.

Evangelization of the whole world and the whole world his parish —such were the ideals that gripped him from his youth and held him till the end. As an undergraduate at Princeton, as the leader in the student uprising at Northfield, among students in Great Britain, in India and every part of Europe and North America, Robert Wilder had one conviction, one message, one passion—Jesus Christ.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter is that which tells of Wilder's work among India's students. This was the land of his birth and of his distinguished father's missionary career. When the first Brahman student was baptized at Poona tremendous opposition arose. The mob did their best to put an end to evangelism. But, we read, "A new hall was secured, and the work continued despite opposition. 'Prayer upset every device of our adversaries,' said Wilder. To him the trials of the work were neither climate, nor separation from friends, nor persecution, 'but seeing men step up to the line without crossing it'—men who confessed Christ hindered from becoming baptized by persecution or by their fear of it."

The final years of Robert Wilder were spent as secretary of the Near East Christian Council. Here he was face-to-face with Islam from Morocco to Persia. His principles and missionary practice did not change. Witness his last address given at the Brummana Conference on "Vision and Obedience." He was a man of faith and prayer. "Christ's main work is intercession," he said. "Shall it be our main work too?" The grave in the grove of pine trees at Nordheim still speaks the message of this life wholly surrendered to God. His last letter written from Norway March 14th, 1938, expressed to his friend, Dr. Mott, his deep life-long convictions regarding the work of evangelism. This is a great story for the present generation of students in all the world.

S. M. Zwemer.

The Missionary Message of the Bible. By Julian Price Love. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1941. pp. 203. $2.00.

There have been earlier volumes on this subject especially those by Dr. W. O. Carver of the Southern Baptist Seminary. The author writes a prologue on Stemming the Tide of Retreat (due to such books as "The Laymen's Report" and the more recent "Living Religions and a World Faith"). These, he says, "do not indeed deny the validity of Christian missions but they seek such a fundamental change in the philosophy and the method of missionary effort as to suggest a revolution in the traditional thinking of many." The first part of this volume deals with the missionary message of the Old Testament (pp. 15-75). The real missionary content of the Old Testament centers in the Messianic hope which is treated more fully and far better in Dr. Charles A. Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*. The New Testament part (pp. 76-175) is better and tells of the mission of Christ, the universal note in his teaching, the missionary strategy of the Book of Acts and Paul's "Manifestoes of a World-Wide Church."

We are surprised that there is no reference to the theory that Jesus Christ was not conscious of a universal mission (held by

Harnack and others) which was so ably refuted by Dr. Max Meinertz in his *Jesus und die Heidenmission* (Münster 1925). The author has given us a compact study of the missionary *message* in the Bible. He has not dealt with its missionary principles, except in desultory fashion.

S. M. Zwemer.

The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart. By Ambrose. Translated from the Old French by Merton Jerome Hubert, with Notes, etc., by John L. La Monte. New York, Columbia University Press, 1941.

This volume (No. XXIV, "Records of Civilization," Austin P. Evans, Editor) is of interest from several aspects. As a rhymed translation of a jongleur chronicle, it introduces the gratified reader of today to the entertainment of our XIII century ancestors and should tempt him to closer acquaintance with the charm of the Old French. The translator has relieved the characteristic monotony by appropriate headings, but otherwise has worked well within the characteristic genre. As witness of the course of the Third Crusade, this chronicle has long been known in the original as closely parallel with others (*cf.* "Introduction"), except for occasional incidents. It shows a contemporary if not participating author and the evidence is "from the front." The editor has added most useful notes, identifying persons and places and referring to other narratives, including the Arabic. The appended genealogies are as convenient as their relationships are complicated.

While this story is not in the present style of war correspondence, it is still of interest as a vivid report of mediaeval war, with side-lights upon manners. The author's enthusiasm for Holy Warfare does not mitigate its horrors, nor does loyalty to King Richard conceal the barbarian actualities of his leadership and following.

Missionaries, successors of the Crusaders, impeded as they too are by political and economic considerations, will be particularly interested to note that the apparent failure of the Crusade was its actual success in opening Jerusalem to Pilgrims and the East and West to mutual intercourse. Today we can understand how the German Emperor and the English King had come under the influence of the superior Near East culture and economy of their Mediterranean possessions, and into the political and military experience of the Latin Kingdom. They gained by their much condemned peace what they were failing to win by ruinous war. They now came into touch with civilization in Arabic and with Saladin, its type.

Our jongleur attributes this counsel to Saladin:

> "However great a prince I be,
> I should prefer to have in me
> Reason and measure and largesse
> To courage carried to excess."

In the patience of the centuries, the people of King Richard have followed him into peace with the people of Saladin, and the Church Militant is now armed rather with "reason and measure and largesse" than with "war as an instrument of policy."

Stanford, Kentucky Robert Shelby Darbishire.

Injīl Marqus. The Gospel according to St. Mark in Palestinian Colloquial Arabic. British and Foreign Bible Society. Syrian Orphanage Press, Jerusalem 1940.

It is, indeed, difficult, if not impossible, to reproduce any dialect through the medium of the Arabic system of writing. This fact alone is enough to foredoom such attempts. Furthermore, the present work is an approximation, not of the vernacular of Palestine, but of that of an unlettered Palestinian who is trying to speak Classical Arabic. No one speaking the colloquial of Palestine would differentiate between the *thā'* and the *tā'*. In this particular, Littman's work, *Modern Arabic Tales* (Leyden, 1905), is more accurate.

It is, therefore, best to evaluate the work on the basis of the purpose for which it was written, and the degree to which it fulfils that purpose. The purpose of the work is to place the glad tidings at the disposal of the untutored masses of Palestine—to bring the Gospel down to the people. Which rendition would appeal more to those masses—the present one or the standard Arabic version, known as the "American"? Which one stands a better chance of being understood?

The majority of the Palestinian Arabs are Moslems, who would scoff at anything not in perfect Arabic. You cannot hold their attention unless you emulate the Koran. The closer the Christian literature comes to that stylistic norm the greater its influence would be among the Moslems. As to Christians, they are believers already, and they certainly understand, enjoy, and prefer the current American translation.

This much for the immediate purpose of the rendition. But what about the whole question of colloquial Arabic literature? The relation of colloquial Arabic to Classical Arabic is analogous to that of the different Romance languages, or rather dialects, to Latin during the early Middle Ages. So long as the spiritual unity of the Latin world remained intact none of these dialects had a real chance of becoming a literary language. Only when that spiritual unity broke down did those dialects develop into separate languages and acquire an independent literature.

The spiritual unity of the Arabic-speaking world remains, for better or worse, intact. The Arabic language of the Koran remains the greatest cultural bond and common heritage of all Arabic-speaking peoples, be they in Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, or North Africa. This condition is not likely to change. In fact the resurgence of Arab nationalism has gone hand in hand with Arabic renaissance. The bases of the Arab awakening are primarily cultural and literary. To me, they are inexorably linked together, thereby precluding any possibility that any of the dialects could become sufficiently differentiated to warrant its literary development. Side by side with the King's English we have the cockney speech, but I still have to see or hear of Cranmer's incomparable diction rendered into the East London jargon—and called literature.

Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey NABIH AMIN FARIS.

CURRENT TOPICS

Under the Harvest-Moon in Java

This is how Christians and Moslems meet to discuss under the harvest-moon at their festivals, writes Mrs. E. W. Schotel in *The Church Times:*

"Kampong Sawah is an exception in this Islamic country, a settlement of Christians—the largest one of some five or six in the neighbourhood of the capital. It is hardly known even to Batavia people themselves. It has a wonderful history.

"The beginning was the work of a government official, a Christian of high standard who lived in Batavia during the second half of the century.

"He made a point of inviting some of the street vendors to the backyard of his house and having friendly chats with them. These people came from the villages in the neighborhood, far and near, and when they went back to their homes they had made friends with the kind gentleman and knew something of the Bible, some text, the Lord's Prayer, or the Apostles' Creed. In this way he went on, sending his 'missionaries' back to their villages to tell their fellow-villagers about the new 'Ilmoe' (doctrine of Salvation). A kind of Christian fellowship came into being in the village of Kampong Sawah (meaning Village of the Rice-fields), and when Batavia became a mission field, this community was confided to the care of the local missionary."

"Still this community is a very living one," declares the missionary. "They are open to that great Islamic world around them and they have their evenings of conversation with their Moslem neighbors. Deep into the bright moonlit nights, when the tropical serenity breathlessly envelopes the trees and silvery sawahs, people sit together by the side of their houses, talking about this new creed. Questions are put by the Moslem people that have been moving their thoughts and their hearts for a long time. They want to talk over the wonder of the force that has changed the lives of their Christian friends now for such a long time already. The murmur of their voices mingles with the hum of the insects, and in the coming days and evenings their talk will go on and on until somebody feels himself drawn toward the small community of Christians."

Riza Shah Pahlevi, 1925-1941

The career of Riza Shah Pahlevi, ex-Shah of Persia, will be judged later in the impartial light of history. For the present it may be profitable to recall briefly the circumstances under which he came to govern Persia and to try to assess the services which

he rendered to the country. For far-reaching changes were made during his reign. Before the last war a period of decadence had set in in Persia and the power of the central Government had greatly declined. This coincided with the extension of Imperial Russian power throughout the regions lying north of Persia and led to the increasing Russian influence in that area. In the south the British Government undertook various measures to counteract the northern menace. The oil fields were also becoming important. The decadence of the central Government encouraged resistance and lawlessness among the Persian tribes, who form the most virile part of the population and who number at least a quarter of the people. The corruption of the general administration of the country was notorious.

* * * * * *

The new Shah's chief task lay in the restoration of law, order and security and the raising of his country to a place among the modern nations. His necessarily limited outlook showed him only one way to this end. He created within a few years a new-model army directly under his personal control. With this army as his instrument he subjugated one by one the nomadic tribes and other disaffected elements. It is to be regretted that this work should have been one of retribution and punishment, marred by the execution of many tribal leaders and, in some cases, by the ruin of the tribes through the confiscation of their livestock and their forcible conversion into settled cultivators.

During the ex-Shah's reign communications in Persia had been greatly developed. Before his reign the country possessed only one Russian-built road from the Caspian to Teheran and a few other roads built by British military forces. During his reign an extensive road-system had been constructed throughout the country. A still greater achievement had been the construction of the Trans-Iran railway, from the new port of Bander Shahpur, near the head of the Persian Gulf, to Bander Shah at the south-eastern corner of the Caspian Sea. This single-track line, constructed by an international agency, has a total length of 865 miles and involved a total cost of £30,000,000, all of which huge sum has been raised in Persia. The raising of this vast sum is partly responsible for the tragic poverty of the peasants. The construction of this line represents a wonderful feat of railway engineering as the track runs across two formidable mountain ranges.

* * * * * *

During the ex-Shah's reign the modernization of Persia had been greatly accelerated through the reorganization and spread of education of all kinds, and through social reforms; most especially through the unveiling of the Muslim women and the raising of their status. To accomplish this the ex-Shah had not only to break through age-long custom, but also to curb the powerful Shia Muslim clergy, who were noted for their reactionary tendencies. The national spirit of Persia has been raised by the abolition of the Capitulations, while in the economic life of the country considerable progress has been made by the establishment of local industries, by the foundation of a national bank and by other measures.

In questions of foreign policy the chief object of the ex-Shah was to make his country independent of all foreign influence, and more especially to eliminate the influence of the two countries which possessed the greatest economic and therefore political interests in Persia—viz., Russia in the north and Great Britain in the south. It seems clear that he pushed this policy beyond the bounds of realism and committed the error of leaning heavily on the aid of Germany, a proceeding which caused his downfall. Nevertheless, an impartial view will show that as a patriotic Persian the ex-Shah can hardly be blamed for seeking to make his country completely independent, although he adopted wrong methods in trying to accomplish his purpose. Persian relations with her three immediate neighbours, Turkey, Iraq and Afghanistan, have improved since the conclusion of the Saadabad Pact in July, 1937.

In conclusion, the failings of the rule of Riza Shah Pahlevi are those generally to be found in all countries governed by dictators and have been accentuated in recent years by the growth of his cruelty, cupidity and love of gain. On the balance it must be admitted that he has accomplished a great deal towards national regeneration. The country is stronger, more stable, more united, and may be yet more prosperous than when he took over the rule. It is through his efforts that Persia will be better fitted to take a place in the modern world. The good wishes of this Society go to his son who has succeeded him.

—*Royal Central Asian Journal,* Oct. '41.

Rationalizing Moslem Ablution

Muhammad Awin, a Barrister-at-Law, writes in *The Light* (Lahore) on the pillars of Islam. We quote his remarks on ablution:

"Prayer is called in the Holy Quran *salat.* Before we perform the *salat* we have to make ablutions, so it is better to mention their benefits:—

First we must wash our hands which is the hygiene of hands. As we have to touch all manner of things and shake hands with all kinds of people it is therefore of the utmost importance to wash our hands frequently. Next we wash our mouth. This cleanses our teeth and prevents tartar as well as pyorrhoea which is a curse of this age and causes much misery. If the teeth be not properly cleaned they begin to decay and not only disfigure a man but give rise to many serious diseases. The germs which breed in the mouth get swallowed with our food and drink, and cause cancer of the stomach and other internal ailments. So washing the mouth is greatly conducive to health.

"We next wash our nose from inside. When we breathe, the germs and the dust which are in the air we breathe get deposited among the hair in our noses which filter the air before allowing it to go further. If these germs be allowed to multiply in the nose they cause irritation and lead to bad cold which is a washing-out process on the part of nature. We can avoid many a cold by keeping our noses clean. Sometimes these germs get into the lungs and cause

pneumonia and even consumption. Thus the importance of washing out the nose will become apparent.

"We then wash our face. This is very refreshing and cools the eyes also. We next wash our arms up to the elbows which has a stimulating effect on the arms however tired they may be. Next we pass our wet hands over the head and the back of the neck as also over and behind the ears. The cold water is a great tonic and makes our brains feel refreshed, removes the extra heat and tones up the roots of the hair at the same time.

"Next we wash our feet. This accelerates the circulation of blood in the body. Thus it will be seen that our *wuzu* or ablutions are both hygienic as well as vitalising.

"And while purifying the body, mentally we are purifying the heart also. For all this is done with the object of making ourselves worthy of appearing in the presence of God."

The Berbers of Eastern Algeria

From *The Geographical Journal* (London) we select some paragraphs from an interesting article on this group of Moslems by George A. T. Kimble:

Altogether there are well over one hundred villages in the Aurès: most of them do not exceed a thousand inhabitants, but Menâa, one of the largest, has upwards of two thousand. Since the pacification of the country towards the end of the nineteenth century, the Chaouïa population has almost doubled. Even so the average density per square mile is less than forty, including Europeans.

And what of the impact of French civilization upon native society? "Assimilation" is the order of the day, but such is the strength of tradition among the Berbers that this process is perforce very slow; all the same, assimilation, early or late, is the goal of every administrator. In education, to consider only one field of colonial enterprise, this means that all teaching, even in elementary schools, is in French. It means moreover that the curriculum is substantially the same as that employed in the metropolitan areas of France. In spite of a strong practical bent, much of the instruction is ill-adapted to the necessities of native life. Thus boys attending a school, whose only contact with civilization is a radio set and a bi-weekly postal service, are taught to produce and print their own magazine; there are plenty of errors, needless to say, but nobody is going to notice them in a country where many people still cannot distinguish between one letter and another. The girls, when they attend, are taught knitting, laundering, European cooking, and table etiquette—arts bearing no relation to the primitive appointments of the native house which is as bare of furniture and linen as it is innocent of sanitation.

At the same time many schools can boast fine experimental gardens where the French masters are annually proving the value of new crops, such as green vegetables and orchard fruits, ...

Unfortunately the native is slow to copy such good examples. His fields are full of stones that would make magnificent retaining walls for terraces, but he would not dream of disturbing them:

"Allah put them there; let no man remove them." Again, when he is given seed potatoes by the French authorities he merely adds them to his evening bowl of *couscous*.

In brief, the Berber's main interest in "culture" is to learn enough French to get him through his three years' conscription in comfort and perhaps enable him to take a temporary job in one of the big cities, such as Constantine, Algiers, or even Paris. And a surprising number of Berbers, Chaouïas, and Kabyles alike, do emigrate temporarily. It is not uncommon to find 10 to 15 per cent. of the adult male population of a village away from home. Most of them will be engaged in menial work, scavenging, and car-washing for instance, which none the less offers good pay by native standards. The younger men often stay until they have accumulated enough money to buy their brides—a good-looking woman costs anything up to 2500 francs—and settle down on a piece of land in their old village.

Moslem Head-dress in Egypt

Readers remember the battle which took place some time ago between the turban and the tarboosh. In recent days some of the students of the Azhar have attempted to exchange the turban for the Faruqiya (a headgear resembling the service cap worn today by the British troops), and so the battle has arisen anew; this time between the turban and the Faruqiya. We learn of some solutions of the problem from correspondence in the *Ahram* (Cairo):

Replying to the reporter's questions Sheikh Abd el Meguid al Labban, head of the College of Religious Principles said, in brief, "I think it is not to the advantage of Azharites to forsake the turban, for in doing so they lose the Azharite characteristic and their special character as ulama." Then he said with vigor, "When has the turban been a hindrance to progress? . . . . The turban is indeed an old costume; but is every ancient dress despicable? Some of the European peoples have held to their ancient dress without being shamed by its age. I don't understand those who say that an ancient costume prevents progress, for there is no connection between dress and progress. Indeed our religion has urged us to think and to discover and to work for the kingdom of heaven and earth, and as long as one holds to the fundamentals of his religion no costume will prevent him from making progress even though one were to wear a donkey cover."

"If the learned men of religion forsake the turban, they will be forsaking an identifying mark which is a heritage of custom and tradition."

The correspondent also asked Sheikh Mahmud Abul 'Uyun to express his opinions on the matter. After speaking of the fact that no costume is ever permanently established without change in any nation, Sheikh Mahmud said, "Our nation does not have a special official dress, but every one dresses as he pleases, and especially is there variation in our head dress," whereupon he listed seven different types of headgear now in common usage in various parts of Egypt."